

STUDIES, ADDRESSES
AND
PERSONAL PAPERS

K. KOHLER

Orient. Inst.

The University of Chicago
Libraries



GIFT OF

*Alumni Assn of Hebrew
Union College.*

STUDIES, ADDRESSES,
AND
PERSONAL PAPERS

BY

DR. K. KOHLER
W

NEW YORK

THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF THE
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
THE BLOCH PUBLISHING CO., AGENT

1931

BM755
K7 A3
Orient Inst.

Gift of COPYRIGHT, 1931, BY
THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE



PRINTED AT
THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY PRESS
PHILADELPHIA, PA., U.S.A.

971823

TO

MRS. JOHANNA EINHORN KOHLER

DEVOTED DAUGHTER WIFE PARENT

A MOTHER IN ISRAEL

an active part in the reading of the proofs, especially of the German portion. To Miss Rose Kohler and Miss Lili Kohler, as well as to Dr. Max J. Kohler and Mr. Edgar J. Kohler, we are indebted for collecting the material, for reading the proofs, and for other forms of help which facilitated the publication. Dr. Max J. Kohler also prepared the Bibliography, which will enhance the worth of this book to students and admirers of his sainted father.

The Publication Committee of the Alumni Association consisted of the following: Rabbis William H. Fineshriber, Joseph S. Kornfeld, Harry S. Margolis, Jonah B. Wise, and H. G. Enelow, Chairman. Rabbi Margolis, also, acted as Chairman of the KOHLER MEMORIAL FUND.

H. G. E.

CONTENTS

I. STUDIES

	PAGE
1. HELLENISM AND JUDAISM.....	3
2. THE ESSENES AND THE APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.....	20
3. DOSITHEUS THE SAMARITAN HERESIARCH.....	37
4. THE HALAKIK PORTIONS IN JOSEPHUS' ANTIQUITIES.....	69
5. THE SABBATHS AND FESTIVALS IN PRE-EXILIC AND EXILIC TIMES	86
6. THE TETRAGRAMMATON AND ITS USES.....	102
7. SHEMA YISRAEL.....	113
8. THE PSALMS IN THE LITURGY.....	122
9. DIE BIBEL UND DIE TODESSTRAFE.....	149

II. ADDRESSES

1. THE MISSION OF ISRAEL.....	177
2. BACKWARD OR FORWARD.....	201
I. FIRST DISCOURSE.....	201
II. FORM OR SPIRIT.....	208
III. PIETY OR A LIVING RELIGION.....	214
IV. IS REFORM DESTRUCTIVE OR CONSTRUCTIVE?.....	220
V. PALESTINIAN OR AMERICAN JUDAISM.....	229
3. THREE DISCOURSES ON JEWISH ETHICS.....	236
I. SOURCE AND CHARACTER.....	236
II. TRUTH, RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND HOLINESS.....	242
III. THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN.....	448
4. THE SYNAGOGUE AND THE CHURCH IN THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS	251
5. HUMAN BROTHERHOOD.....	266
6. HARMONIZATION OF LAWS OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.....	275
7. ISRAEL'S SOLIDARITY.....	316
8. THE FAITH OF REFORM JUDAISM.....	325
9. THE KADDISH.....	335
10. PHILO (GERMAN).....	342
11. MAIMONIDES AND RASHI.....	353
12. MOSES MENDELSSOHN.....	364
13. LEOPOLD ZUNZ (GERMAN).....	383
14. JEWISH WIT AND HUMOR.....	395

an active part in the reading of the proofs, especially of the German portion. To Miss Rose Kohler and Miss Lili Kohler, as well as to Dr. Max J. Kohler and Mr. Edgar J. Kohler, we are indebted for collecting the material, for reading the proofs, and for other forms of help which facilitated the publication. Dr. Max J. Kohler also prepared the Bibliography, which will enhance the worth of this book to students and admirers of his sainted father.

The Publication Committee of the Alumni Association consisted of the following: Rabbis William H. Fineshriber, Joseph S. Kornfeld, Harry S. Margolis, Jonah B. Wise, and H. G. Enelow, Chairman. Rabbi Margolis, also, acted as Chairman of the KOHLER MEMORIAL FUND.

H. G. E.

CONTENTS

I. STUDIES

	PAGE
1. HELLENISM AND JUDAISM.....	3
2. THE ESSENES AND THE APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.....	20
3. DOSITHEUS THE SAMARITAN HERESIARCH.....	37
4. THE HALAKIK PORTIONS IN JOSEPHUS' ANTIQUITIES.....	69
5. THE SABBATHS AND FESTIVALS IN PRE-EXILIC AND EXILIC TIMES	86
6. THE TETRAGRAMMATON AND ITS USES.....	102
7. SHEMA YISRAEL.....	113
8. THE PSALMS IN THE LITURGY.....	122
9. DIE BIBEL UND DIE TODESSTRAFE.....	149

II. ADDRESSES

1. THE MISSION OF ISRAEL.....	177
2. BACKWARD OR FORWARD.....	201
I. FIRST DISCOURSE.....	201
II. FORM OR SPIRIT.....	208
III. PIETY OR A LIVING RELIGION.....	214
IV. IS REFORM DESTRUCTIVE OR CONSTRUCTIVE?.....	220
V. PALESTINIAN OR AMERICAN JUDAISM.....	229
3. THREE DISCOURSES ON JEWISH ETHICS.....	236
I. SOURCE AND CHARACTER.....	236
II. TRUTH, RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND HOLINESS.....	242
III. THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN.....	448
4. THE SYNAGOGUE AND THE CHURCH IN THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS	251
5. HUMAN BROTHERHOOD.....	266
6. HARMONIZATION OF LAWS OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.....	275
7. ISRAEL'S SOLIDARITY.....	316
8. THE FAITH OF REFORM JUDAISM.....	325
9. THE KADDISH.....	335
10. PHILO (GERMAN).....	342
11. MAIMONIDES AND RASHI.....	353
12. MOSES MENDELSSOHN.....	364
13. LEOPOLD ZUNZ (GERMAN).....	383
14. JEWISH WIT AND HUMOR.....	395

15. JEWISH SUPERSTITION.....	404
16. THE ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS TO JEWISH LITERATURE.....	413
17. ASSYRIOLOGY AND THE BIBLE.....	426
18. WHAT DOES THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE STAND FOR.....	439
19. THE SPIRIT OF GOD.....	448
20. ZIONISM.....	453

III. PERSONAL PAPERS

1. PERSONAL REMINISCENCES.....	469
2. INAUGURAL ADDRESS, DETROIT (GERMAN).....	481
3. INAUGURAL ADDRESS, CHICAGO (GERMAN).....	497
4. INAUGURAL ADDRESS, NEW YORK (GERMAN).....	509
5. A PIONEER OF REFORM JUDAISM (DR. EINHORN).....	522
6. MEMORIAL ADDRESS FOR JACOB H. SCHIFF.....	529
7. DR. ALEXANDER KOHUT.....	539
8. EMIL G. HIRSCH.....	544
9. THE H. U. C. YESTERDAY AND TODAY.....	555

IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

A SUPPLEMENTAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DR. KAUFMANN KOHLER.....	565
---	-----

V. NOTES

NOTES	581
-------------	-----

I. STUDIES

HELLENISM AND JUDAISM

THE universality of Judaism is clearly and positively declared in the very first chapters of Sacred Scripture, which start with the history of man and lead up to one of the most remarkable passages of the entire ancient literature—the list of the nations then known to the civilized world, divided into the three groups: Shem, Ham, and Japheth. No other nation of hoary antiquity produced a similar document of such cosmopolitan character as the Jewish genius did in this tenth chapter of Genesis. And this priceless catalogue of seventy nations—obviously compiled before Persia appeared on the stage of history, because it is not mentioned alongside of Media—is preceded by a wonderful oracle ascribed to Noah as the father of three race-groups, which tells of the future destiny of civilized mankind, of the interlinking of Aryan and Semitic culture: “God shall enlarge Japheth and He shall dwell in the tents of Shem, while Ham or Canaan shall serve them.” The rabbis found predicted here the union of the beauty of Hellenic culture and the lofty idealism of the Jew. It was certainly one of the most important turning points of history when Alexander of Macedonia, the pupil of Aristotle, by his conquests of Asia and Africa, made the two great streams of civilization meet.

Before turning, however, to the great revolution of life and thought brought about by this marvelous world-conqueror under the victorious banner of Hellenism, let me cast some light on the achievement of Alexander's great prototype, the Persian world-conqueror, Cyrus, who first brought Aryan and Semitic culture into closer contact. It was really Cyrus who opened the world's horizon for Jew and Javan (that is, Ionian Hellas). The universalism of Deutero-Isaiah was inspired by the victorious march of Cyrus, while the beginnings of Hellenic culture can be traced to Persian influence. Remember, also, that when Ezra the Scribe brought the Book of the Law of Moses from Babylon to Judea, he had

it written not in the hieroglyphic-like letters preserved by the Samaritans, but in the more handy square letters used at the Persian court, while the Aramaic, the language of the whole East, not the Hebrew, became the language of the Jewish people. As a matter of fact, all the institutions and practices of the Synagogue, as well as the current views of the people, bear henceforth the stamp of Persian influence. Only the wise and tolerant policy of Cyrus, whose God, Ahura-Mazda, as the God of Heaven, appeared to him identical with Israel's Only One God, inspired the Jew with the hope of a great world-religion that would finally unite all mankind and render his temple at Jerusalem 'a house of prayer for all nations.'

It is easy to see what mighty impression Cyrus must have made upon the Greeks, when we read the romantic description given of him by Xenophon as model for the training of the young. No doubt before the vision of young Alexander, the ambitious son of the Macedonian soldier-king Philip, there stood as powerful incentive the picture of Cyrus, the world-conqueror. But his providential task was a far greater one. He was not only to wed the Orient and the Occident, as he himself expressed it in the symbolic wedding feast he celebrated at his capital in Susa; he actually bridged the wide gulf which separated, even in the minds of Plato and Aristotle, Greek from Barbarian. He became the god-father of that Hellenism which inaugurated the era of a cosmopolitan humanity, altogether unknown before and only foreshadowed in religious life by Israel's great seers. Using Greek culture as the all-penetrating and all-cementing force, Alexander endeavored to merge the various lands and nationalities into one homogeneous whole, and when a sudden death put an end to his astonishing achievements, his successors to the throne in Egypt and Syria worked in the same spirit, giving the entire political, social and intellectual life of the nations everywhere the impulse and the tendency toward a common humanity in the garb of Hellenic culture. There followed a lively exchange of material goods from all parts of the globe, owing to the enlarged scope and facility of commerce, and no less also of ideas and views, owing to extensive travel and the common mode of speech. The

language of Athens became the *lingua franca*, the common language of commerce and culture—the *koine*. Thus there was effected not merely a change of the map of Europe and Asia, but the nations everywhere underwent a great transformation.

No wonder if Alexander the Great was soon made the subject of fable and romance. Josephus has the legend that when appearing at the gates of Jerusalem, Alexander was met by the high priest, Jaddua, before whom he prostrated himself, as if in the presence of a god, and when reproached, said that he had seen a similar venerable god-like person in a vision, predicting to him his victory over the Persians. The Samaritans claimed similar distinctions from him. There is no reason to doubt the fact that, like Cyrus before him, and Caesar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon after him, he beheld in the Jew a valuable aid in carrying out his cosmopolitan designs. He had Jews joining his army as volunteers, and rewarded them by offering them privileges when they settled down in the new city of Alexandria, which he had built. And afterwards the Ptolemies and early Seleucides followed his example. What King Solomon and Ahab failed to achieve, to render some of the Jews sea-faring men of commerce, the new conditions accomplished. As may be learned from the story of Jonah and Psalm CVII, the Jews ventured out on the high sea and into distant islands.

But they had not merely merchandise, like their Phoenician neighbors, to offer, but they attracted the attention of the higher classes by their wisdom and learning. We are told of Aristotle, by one of his pupils, Clearchus, that he was greatly impressed by the depth of thought displayed by a Jew he had met, who was, as he said, a Greek not only in language, but also in mind. So are the Jews of the time spoken of by Greek authors as if they formed a class of philosophers among the Phoenicians, similar to the saintly sages of India called the Gymnosophists. Wherever the great highroads of Western Asia and the Mediterranean seaports offered opportunity for commerce and industry, the versatile Jew availed himself of the same with striking success, so that Strabo, the Roman writer, later on says that there is

scarcely a city on the globe where the Jews are not making both socially and religiously their influence felt. But there they were confronted by the same serious problem that confronted the Jew everywhere in the dispersion—the problem of assimilation, which presents, according to the standpoint we take, two sides of the shield: Do we know how, by the right power of resistance and self-assertion, to assimilate the new elements of culture we come in touch with, so as to render them helps and incentives to enlarge and deepen our own individuality as Jews, or are we being assimilated while yielding, so as to lose our identity in the conflict of views and habits? This was the great problem of Hellenism versus Judaism. Having its center in the great metropolis of Alexandria, while religiously linked to Jerusalem, Hellenism was for centuries a power for good. It expanded the vision and the scope of Judaism. It elucidated and deepened its ideals, and remoulded its religious views by blending it with the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle and the broad humanitarianism of the Stoic schools. It made it a world-conquering force, winning thousands of heathens of the upper classes for the monotheistic faith of Israel. Quite different was its effect upon the pleasure-seeking Jew in Syria and Palestine, where Greek culture was but the varnish to shield the voluptuousness and gross sensualism indulged in by the people still under the influence of idolatrous cults and customs. Here the charm and glitter of Hellenism became a menace to Judaism, and a pitfall to the ruling and wealthy classes of the Jews. Here no compromise was possible. War had to be declared on the Hellenists to save the Law, to save Judaism from shipwreck. And this war, waged by the Maccabean heroes, in unison with the Ḥasidim, was ultimately turned against the Maccabean dynasty itself; nay, against all Greek culture—*Hokmah yevanit*—when it became a disintegrating force in Judea, and it ended with the withdrawal of the Jew from the great Greek-speaking world, allowing the Christian church to reap the harvest of the seeds sown by Jewish Hellenism throughout the wide globe. And this tragedy was greater than that of the loss of the State of Judea. It was here that the real Ghetto of the Jew began.

Of course, the narrow-minded nationalist, for whom

neither Deutero-Isaiah nor the book of Jonah have any higher significance, sees in Hellenism the same departure from Judaism as in Reform Judaism of our days. He has no appreciation of the far-reaching and lasting beneficial influence Alexandrian Judaism had on the whole intellectual and spiritual life of the Jewish people. Let me then call attention to one fact which is not brought out strongly enough by our historians, and that is that the various Greek inscriptions discovered in the remotest parts of Egypt, Europe, and Asia, dating back to the third Pre-Christian century, give ample evidence that, wherever Jews had settled down, either in military camps or in commercial and industrial colonies, they had their Synagogue testify to their adherence to the Jewish faith. Just as those who came under the Persian monarchy as soldiers to Egypt had an altar built to Israel's God Yahweh, as recent discoveries in the Elephantine Island have acquainted us with, so did the Jew everywhere establish a house of worship in honor of his Only God, henceforth no longer called Yahweh, but Adonai, the Lord, *ho Kyrios*; yea, his divine service held in the vernacular attracted the non-Jewish world, so that we now hear for the first time of proselytes known by the name of *yir'e adonai*, 'Worshippers of the One God.' Henceforth Abraham, the Patriarch of yore, appeared in Jewish literature in the light of a missionary, so as to become the prototype of the wandering Jew through whom all the families of man are to be blessed. The Jew of the Diaspora began to work for the propagation of his faith, and in doing so he could not help broadening himself while laying all stress upon the ethical truth of Judaism, and proudly confessing, over against Greek or Egyptian, his ethical monotheism.

And now we are prepared to follow briefly the destiny of the Jews in Alexandria. In a larger measure than Alexander the Great, did the first Ptolemies encourage the Jews to settle in the new city, which, different from either Athens or Rome, was to be the center of the world's culture. Here Ptolemy Philadelphus created the first great library of the world, and a museum for scholars to cultivate science and literature. Here a powerful impetus was given by royal

support to scientific studies as nowhere before, and the literary treasures of the nations were collected and brought home to the knowledge of the learned. Just because the creative genius of antiquity, of the Greek or the Oriental world, was gone, a romantic love for the old awakened new interest in Homer and Plato, and likewise in the hoary wisdom of Egypt and Babylonia. Of course, they no longer believed in the Homeric gods, and so they turned every story into an allegory expressive of some philosophical or historical idea. The entire past received new meaning for the cultured. In this atmosphere the Alexandrian Jews lived and moved. Thrifty and prosperous as merchants and craftsmen, they soon spread, occupying, as Philo tells us, two of the five sections of the great metropolis, chiefly near the seacoast, and counting well-nigh a million. Among the numerous synagogues they had in various districts, the principal one was such that we are told in the Talmud that "he who did not see it had never seen really beautiful work of architecture." Built in the shape of a Basilica, with a double row of columns, it was of such immense size that the cantor, standing on the Bema, had to use a flag as a signal to the audience when the Amen was to be said in response to the Reader. The people were seated according to their trades: the gold, the silver and coppersmiths and the textile workers had each separate places, while on the platform the seventy elders sat on high chairs. The Jews had a governor of their own, with the title of Alabarch, who possessed a great deal of power, securing them a certain political and civil as well as religious independence. With the exceptions of the Samaritans, for whom the temple on Mount Gerizim was the religious center, the Jews looked upon the temple of Jerusalem as their national sanctuary, to which they sent their annual shekels, and to which they made from time to time their pilgrimages. Even the Onias Temple, at Leontopolis, did not diminish their loyalty to Jerusalem. Thoroughly Hellenic in culture and demeanor, they took pride in their Judaism. The intellectual class would not remain behind their fellow-citizens in the acquisition of Greek wisdom and knowledge.

Yet in the same measure as they spoke and wrote in

the common Hellenic tongue, they forgot their Hebrew. Thus necessity created the translation first of the Five Books of Moses, that were to be read and expounded each Sabbath and Holyday in the Synagogue, in the vernacular. There is a well-known story, told in the letter of Aristeas, repeated by Josephus and Philo, and re-echoed in the Talmud, of the seventy or seventy-two Elders summoned by Ptolemy Philadelphus from Palestine and locked up, each in a separate cell, for seventy-two days, until they had each finished the translation, which turned out to be identical throughout, even in the alterations. Philo tells us that the day when this wonderful translation, the work of inspired men, was finished, was celebrated every year with thanksgiving to God on the island of Pharos, where the translation was made. Rabbinical tradition speaks of ten, thirteen and fifteen alterations these Elders made. One of these is especially significant, and corresponds with our Septuagint. Among the unclean animals, the Torah mentions the hare (*'arnevet*), which in Greek is *lagos*, the name of the ancestor of the Ptolemies, and in order not to offend the King they coined a new word, *s'irat raglayim*, tough-foot (*dasy-pous*). Of course, the miracle tale was invented in order to invest the translation with the same sacred character as the original possessed. As a matter of fact, the translation of the Pentateuch as well as of the other sacred books is not the work of one man nor of one generation, but the product of gradual growth. Nevertheless, the legend must be based upon some positive historic fact, as Graetz points out. Later on, the Septuagint fell into discredit, on account of its differences from the Masoretic text, and the very day of the translation was declared to be rather a day when darkness fell upon Palestine—as great a calamity as when the people worshipped the Golden Calf. Then a new Greek translation was made for the Greek-speaking Jews by Aquilas, the Proselyte, under the supervision of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, in the second Christian century.

Our judgment, however, must not be influenced by the adverse opinion of the schools of this late period. On the contrary, the sacred literature which appeared as *the Book* (the Bible, in the language of the civilized world) brought

the God of Israel and His law of truth and righteousness to the knowledge of the nations, thus performing, as no other work did, the great historic task of the Jew: to be a light to all the people on earth. The very Agadic tale which makes the words of the Decalogue come forth from the mouth of God in the seventy tongues of fire to reach the seventy nations of the world, or the other Agadah, according to which the whole law of Moses was to be engraved in seventy languages upon the stone at the altar of Ebal at the time of Israel's entrance into Canaan, shows what importance was assigned to the translation of the Law for the propagation of the Jewish faith. Here, indeed, were the Deuteronomic words realized: "This is your wisdom and understanding before the eyes of the nations," and so forth. Through the Greek Bible the Jew became actually the religious teacher and educator of humanity for all time. But the translation exerted a great beneficial influence also upon the Jew himself. Not only, as above stated, was the replacing of the name of the Lord for the proper noun Yahveh a great step forward in the spiritualization of the Deity. Still more was done in this direction when all the passages in which God appeared altogether too manlike in form or in feeling—all anthropomorphic and anthropopathic utterances—were so changed as to offer a higher and loftier view of the Deity. God no longer speaks here with Moses 'mouth to mouth,' nor is He here seen. His 'hand' becomes His power, His 'garment,' His glory, and so forth. Having come in touch with Greek thought, the people would no longer take stories of a child-like age literally, and the teachers begin to allegorize Scripture. The sages of Alexandria became *dorshe reshumot* (Allegorists), for whom the written words contained a wealth of hidden wisdom. Also regarding the inner life of man, finer concepts were formed, owing to the contact with Greek thought. A deeper insight into the nature of the soul is noticeable throughout the Alexandrian literature. Such a word as Conscience (*syneidesis*), which has no corresponding term in Hebrew, gives proof of this. Also *faith* is more accentuated. But above all, the belief in the continuity of the soul as contrasted with the perishable body, the Platonic concept of immortality, appears in works like The Wisdom

of Solomon, or the so-called Fourth Book of the Maccabees, to take the place of the Persian belief in the Resurrection of the Body, which was raised to be an indispensable Jewish dogma by the Pharisees.

The great literary activity prevailing in Alexandria naturally stimulated the Jews to participate in the race for recognition of their literature and history. When the translation of the whole Hebrew Scripture was completed, about the middle of the second pre-Christian century, they wrote Greek dramas depicting the Jewish past, and histories in which the Biblical progenitors of the race, the Patriarchs, and Moses, the Law-Giver, were represented as the pioneers of ancient culture, inventors of astronomy, of the art of writing, and so forth. Moreover, they embellished the life of the Biblical heroes, especially of Moses, with tales describing their valor in warfare. Nor would they hesitate to insert in later Biblical books, such as Esther, Daniel and Ezra, and the Chronicles, Agadic chapters such as are preserved in our Apocrypha. Some of these are of real poetic value, such as is the story of Zerubabel as page of the Court of Darius. The line of demarcation between the canonical and apocryphal writings was seemingly not drawn as fast as in Palestine. The warning given at the close of Koheleth against writing more books was not heeded in Alexandria. Of Ben Sira, the grandson of the author tells us that he translated his grandfather's work to add this storehouse of wisdom to the three classes of Scripture already translated in the vernacular. So are the First Book of the Maccabees, Judith and Tobit translations from the Hebrew, while the other Apocryphal and Apocalyptic books were almost all written in Greek.

At times these Alexandrian writers went, in their endeavor and chauvinistic zeal to extol the past of the Jew, so far as to lose all sense of history and religion. For example, they identified Moses with Musaeus, or with Hermes, and Joseph with the god Serapis. On the whole, they worked ardently for the propagation of the Jewish faith and in defense of the Jewish people and their religious institutions. The Hellenic literature of the Jews has, accordingly, a two-fold character: the one is propagandistic, and the other apologetic.

Anti-semitism had its cradle in Alexandria, where the industrial and intellectual success of the Jew aroused the jealousy and hatred of many. This gave rise to the apologetic literature. It is hard to say whether and how far the Alexandrian mob participated in the persecution of the Jews by Ptolemy Physcon, who had drunken elephants sent into the arena to massacre the Jews, but it had failed, owing to a miraculous intercession of God, as described in the Third Book of the Maccabees. The notice that the day of deliverance was celebrated every year as a sort of Egyptian Purim seems to prove the historic character of the main fact. In general, the Ptolemies favored the Jews. All the more cause for the Anti-Semites to malign them. Manetho, who wrote a history of Egypt about the middle of the second century, was the first to represent the Hebrews—in contrast to the Biblical story—as a class of despised Shepherds, the Hyksos, driven out of the land, as plague-stricken and vicious, worshippers of an ass as a deity, and so forth. Other writers followed his example in slandering the Jews and their law-giver, as well as their worship at the Temple of Jerusalem, alleging that they brought heathen men as sacrifices. In refutation of these malicious charges, Jewish authors wrote histories of the Exodus and other works extolling the virtues and wisdom of Moses and Joseph as statesmen. But all these books are lost; only the names of the writers and a few excerpts of their writings have been preserved by Josephus.

Most peculiar is the propaganda literature produced by the Alexandrian Jews of this epoch. Most of it consists of what has rather unjustly been called 'literary forgeries,' because names of well-known classic authors or famous personalities of the heathen world are represented there as having composed poetic verses or whole books condemning the views and practices of the idolatrous nations, and solemnly proclaiming the monotheistic faith with its pure ethics instead. We must not forget that no writer of antiquity hesitated to ascribe the views he held to heroes he admired, and to assign addresses or letters he composed to them. Pseudepigraphic writing, consciously or unconsciously done, was rather the rule than the exception. Think of Plato's Dialogues! And, again, of the laws of Moses or of Manu! To this very

day the Masonic ritual ascribes to King Solomon utterances and ideas belonging to the seventeenth century deists. This procedure, distasteful to our critical-historic age, seemed the best way to win the heathen world for the religious truth of Judaism, and create out of its midst, as far as possible, God worshippers, observers of the Noahitic laws of humanity. To this end, well-known poets, like Menander, Euripides, Phocylides, and even Homer, the philosopher Heraclitus, the historian Hecataeus and many others, were made composers of religious sentences expressive of the truth of Judaism. Foremost among these productions were the Sibylline books. Using obscure and dreary oraculous verses, circulating in the East and West under the name of the Sibyl (the famous soothsayer), whether in Chaldea or in Etruria and Samos, predicting earthquakes and plagues, floods and conflagrations for the various lands, these clever Jewish authors represented the heathen Sibyl as the daughter-in-law of Noah, preaching repentance to the generation of the flood, exactly as the Agadists of Palestine described Noah as preacher warning his contemporaries of the coming catastrophe, unless they repent. So are these Sibylline books given out as monitions to the heathen world to turn away in penitence from the vicious practices of idolatry, homicide and adultery, and become worshippers of the only One and holy God. Composed between the second pre-Christian and the first Christian century, these Sibylline books must have made a deep impression upon the Greek world, which doubted not their genuine character, and which at the same time hailed with joy the promises of a blissful Messianic age held out amidst the collapse of antiquity to all those that would join the holy race of the Hebrews. Christian writers continued these productions with the view of inculcating the dogmas of the Church, so that it is at times really difficult to distinguish between the Jewish and the Christian fabrications.

Especially interesting, also, is the ethical poem composed under the pseudonym of Phocylides. It contains in most exquisite verses the entire system of Jewish ethics based chiefly upon the 19th chapter of Leviticus, while it intentionally refrains from mentioning Israel's Only One God. The entire propaganda work of the Hellenic Jews aimed at

what we would today call a Theistic Church Universal. What the Talmud relates of Hillel's summing up the whole law in the Golden Rule of Love for one's fellow-man was really generations before him the practice of itinerant Jewish teachers throughout the Diaspora. Many of these productions made for the conversion of the heathen were afterwards appropriated by the Christian Church. I will mention only the so-called Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (the *Didache*), originally a Jewish Manual for Proselytes, based upon the *shene derachim*, the Two Ways, and a highly instructive work entitled *Asenath* or the Prayer of Joseph, described in the Jewish Encyclopedia, s. v. *Asenath*.

It is seen, then, what a powerful ferment, affecting the entire heathen world, Hellenistic Judaism was before Paulinian Christianity absorbed it and turned the entire movement into a triumph of the Church. Let me now, before dwelling on the two most prominent types of Jewish Hellenism, Philo and Josephus, proceed for a brief review to Judea, where the contrast between Hellenism and Judaism turned into the bitterest conflict, to end in the complete defeat of the former.

There can be no dispute as to the fact that under the benign reign of the Ptolemies the influence of Hellenism was beneficial. The world's commerce and industry brought not only material goods from all lands, with their Greek names, as is shown by the large Greek vocabulary in the Mishnah, but also Greek habits (such as was the Triclinon and the Symposium), Greek proper nouns and Greek concepts, to the people of Judea. It is certainly not merely incidental that a Jewish master of the law by the name of Antigonus of Soko, at the very beginning of the Hellenistic era, comes forth with an ethical lesson, of which Prof. Toy, of Harvard, says that its like is not found even in the New Testament: "Be not as slaves who work for reward;" that is, let your devotion to duty be truly disinterested. Of course, we see also undercurrents of an Epicurean philosophy, making themselves felt in what was afterwards termed Sadduceism, but is already noticeable in the original book of Koheleth, a skeptical work which was later on interpolated

by the Pharisees to make it acceptable. Ben Sira stands on the border line. His Sheol is the old Hades. He knows neither of Resurrection of the body nor of the Immortality of the Soul, but for him the Torah and Sophia, the Wisdom of the Greeks, are identical as world principles. The crisis came when in place of the more seriously minded Alexandria, the lascivious Syrian metropolis, Antioch, became the dominant power, and instead of the lofty idealism of the Athenian Academy, the degrading features of the theater, gymnasium and public bathhouses, with all the idolatrous practices catering to the lower passions of the people, took the upper hand.

It was Hellenism degenerated into frivolity which became a snare and a stumbling block to the would-be-enlightened Jew. What had become the fashion of the elite in Antioch, the aristocracy of Jerusalem wanted to have, also. They, too, wanted to have their athletic games, where all the innate modesty of the Jew was laid aside and the ancient piety and purity were to give way to pleasure and spectacular show. This was the state of affairs when Jason and Menelaus bought the office of the high priest from the Syrian King Antiochus Epiphanes, and the whole attitude of the Sadducean nobility led him into the belief that it was an easy matter to turn the whole Jewish nation away from their ancestral religion. The King was mistaken. The core of the nation was still sound. The people were ready to die rather than to give up their spiritual heritage. The small but vigorous band of Ḥasidim, who had seen the danger of this new Hellenism, fought it with their lives, and finally waged war against the King, under the leadership of the Hasmonean heroes, until the battle was won. The earnestness of Jewish genius triumphed over the levity of the Greek Muses and Graces. But degenerated Hellenism was not dead. It continued as Epicurean Sadduceeism under the Maccabean dynasty and its half-breed Idumean successors. All the more vigorous and uncompromising was the attitude of the Ḥasidean leaders, henceforth known as Pharisees. The entire Talmudic period, from Shimeon b. Shetaḥ, of the first pre-Christian century to Akiba, of the second Christian century, is marked by the battle of Judaism against Hel-

lenism, in which the Shammaite school would make no concession whatsoever to non-Jewish views and practices, whereas the more liberal Hillelites, who cultivated the Greek culture in their private life, were far more ready for compromise in theory as well as in practice. But then came the great war with Rome, and while under the wise leadership of Johanan ben Zakkai, the disciple of Hillel, the school-house and the Synagogue became the citadel and the impregnable fortress of Judaism for all future generations, the spirit of broad universal Hellenic Judaism died out altogether. Its treasures, falling into the hand of victorious Church, were all lost to the Jew. The defeat of Bar Kokba, the national hero, and his champion, R. Akiba, meant the death blow to Hellenism also in Egypt and Asia Minor. The very name of Philo, the great thinker and zealous defender of Jew and Judaism, as well as of Josephus, the historian, was forgotten. Their works as well as the entire Hellenic literature, including the Apocryphical and Apocalyptic writings, we owe solely to the safekeeping of the Christian churches. Also, the revival of Greek culture under the Mohammedan rulers made it again a source of regeneration for Judaism.

Is it true, then, what the biased English writer, Gerald Friedlander, says, that Hellenism led straightway to Christianity? Certainly not. You can not read either the Halakik or the Agadic teachings of Talmud and Midrash without imbibing ideas imported from Alexandria. Let me refer only to the Synedrion, the Prosbul and the Ketubah (the marriage document insuring to the wife her dower, which was essential to a regular marriage contract under the Ptolemies). And likewise can hundreds of Agadic sayings be traced to Hellenic origin. It is quite significant that the Midrash has preserved for us Aquilas' Greek translation of the words *al mut: athanasia* (Immortality).

Let us conclude with an appreciation of the noblest and most prominent figure among the Alexandrian Jews, Philo, who was, with every fiber of his being, with every particle of his soul and sentiment, a Jew, notwithstanding his thorough Greek training and his whole Platonic and Stoic bent

of mind. Let the historians deny him originality, let the critics withhold from him the recognition of genius; his was the master-mind in whom Plato and Moses became one, just as did Moses and Aristotle in Maimonides. He had, as he states himself, predecessors in allegorizing the Sacred Scripture, but none understood as he did how to combine the Rabbinic Agadah with the popular philosophy of the day; none proclaimed with tongue and pen, with the dignity of a Plato and the ardor of an Isaiah, in the language of the time, the sublime doctrines of Judaism as he did. He had the soul of a mystic, the vision of a seer; he spoke of revelation from actual inner experience, and at the same time he had the penetrating intellect of the thinker wrestling with all the problems of philosophy and theology, only to arrive at the highest concepts of God and soul. What a glow of enthusiasm and zeal for the Jewish heritage is exhibited in his magnificent *Life of Moses*, in his treatises on the Decalogue and on the Laws of Humanity! And, again, how his heart burns with love for the Jewish race when he hurls forth his protest against the Emperor Caligula and against the Roman Prefect Flaccus! Compare this Alexandrian philosopher with the Amsterdam Jew, Baruch Spinoza! Perhaps the latter ranks higher in the history of philosophy, in the analysis of ethics. In true ethics, in spirituality and loyalty, Philo towers high above the idol of Goethe, Schleiermacher and Berthold Auerbach.

True, the allegorizing method employed by Philo was dangerous. It led many contemporaries of his to disregard circumcision and the Sabbath, and finally to turn their backs to Judaism. As in the case of Mendelssohn's household, his own nephew, the son of a brother of his who was Alabarch, apostatized and was placed high in power by the Romans. But Philo rebukes very strongly such disloyalty to the Mosaic law, insisting on the need of specific Jewish institutions and ceremonies for the sake of preserving the Jewish faith. In his endeavor to spiritualize the Deity and lift it far above the world of matter, above the realm of time and space, he identified the creative word of God, the Memra of Rabbinic theology, with Plato's Logos, making him the divine Mediator of Creation, a sort of Demiurg, and calling

him the High Priest of the world, yea, the first-begotten Son of God. This was a grievous error. It led the Fourth Gospel to the doctrine of the Incarnation, the Word made flesh in Christ, and paved the way to the Trinity. But Philo can be held as little responsible for this procedure of the Church as the mystics of the eleventh and twelfth centuries can for the vagaries of the Cabalists and Hasidean wonder-workers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Certainly no one throughout Jewish history accentuated with greater force and eloquence the truth that Israel was chosen by God to be the priest and the prophet among the nations. No one was more emphatic in asserting the mystical sanctity of the Jewish people in view of their world mission than he. Truly, Philo's works ought still to be read, at least in wisely selected extracts, by the Jew of today, and especially by our nationalistic Jews, to make them realize that the mission idea is not an invention of the Reform rabbis nor an imitation of the Church.

And as to Josephus, we will grant that he merited the contempt of his Jewish countrymen by his treachery during the Roman war. We will also grant that his whole history was colored by his endeavor to insinuate himself into the favor of the Roman ruler, whose name Flavius he adopted. He was more of a plagiarist, in fact, than an original author. Nevertheless, his writings contain material of inestimable value for the historian. His apology for the Jewish people, which he published toward the end of his life, under the title, *Contra Apionem*, reminds one of Heine's *Romancero*. It was an apology for his own life. It is one of the most valuable and instructive works in defense of the Jew ever written, and it must have made a mighty impression upon the Roman world. Whether Josephus was well versed in Hebrew lore may be doubted. Philo certainly was not. Here was the great deficiency of Hellenism. It may have caused the final rupture, the severance of the Greek-speaking Jew from the main body. Still, long after Philo, we learn of the great Talmudic master, Joshua ben Hanania, who had frequent personal discussions with the Emperor Hadrian; that during his stay in Alexandria he gave answers to twelve questions propounded to him by the Jewish sages there, some of

Halakik, some of Agadic nature, and some dealing with practical wisdom. Hence we see, up to the second century, the relations between Palestine and Alexandria kept up. At all events, Hellenism stood for the philosophical expansion and the cosmopolitan view of Judaism, and became, as Bentwich, in his book on Philo, well says, "an immense force in the religious history of the world, while Philo, its greatest figure, stands out as the embodiment of the Jewish religious mission, which is to preach to the nations the knowledge of the One God and the law of righteousness."

THE ESSENES AND THE APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

AMONG the treasures of Jewish Literature the Apocalyptic writings are least known to the average Jewish scholar, and their value is scarcely appreciated. The reason is that, while the Church has in some hidden corner of the world, where heretic sects continued to exist, preserved the one or the other, so as to enable learned travellers in recent times to bring them to light, the Jewish world let them fall out of sight together with the Apocryphal books, ever since the beginning of the Talmudic period. Accordingly Dr. Schechter in his *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, p. 5, dismisses both of them with the following remark: "Whilst these writings left a lasting impress on Christianity, they contributed, with the exception perhaps of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, little or nothing toward the formation of Rabbinic thought. The Rabbis were either wholly ignorant of their very existence, or stigmatized them as fabulous or external (a milder expression in some cases for heretical),¹ and thus allowed them to exert no permanent influence upon Judaism."

Obviously the eminent master of Rabbinic lore failed to take due cognizance of the extensive eschatological and cosmological passages, of the angelology and demonology, not to speak of the thaumaturgical matter which occupies so large a place in the Talmud and Midrash, and have exerted a decisive influence upon the views and doctrines of the Rabbis throughout all the centuries. All these show a striking family resemblance to the contents of the Apocalyptic literature and point to a common source of tradition, with the only difference that the latter presents the whole material in a coherent and systematized form, whereas the former has it all given sporadically in the form of tradition without order or system and without claiming any higher authority. Nor should the fact be ignored that some of the apocalyptic books appear in fragmentary form under other names in the Gaonic period, as was especially pointed

out by Jellinek in his instructive introduction to his *Beth ha-Midrash* volumes. On closer investigation we cannot escape the conclusion that for this class of Agadic material there existed among the apocalyptists of the Rabbinic schools a chain of tradition in the form of *מסר* and *קבל* similar to that which existed for the Halakik, as I have shown in the introductory article 'Cabala' in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* with especial reference to the Book of Jubilees. Of course, the Halakik tradition, being concerned with the practice of the law, bore an altogether democratic character in accord with the Pharisaic spirit and was traced back, as the first Mishnah of Abot has it, to the last prophets and from there to Moses on Sinai. The apocalyptic lore, on the other hand, was originally esoteric in character and was believed to have come down as secret lore from the progenitors of the human race, from Enoch, Noah, or Adam and Shem (= Malkizedek), the Patriarchs, and also Job. This cosmopolitan view was given up by the Rabbis after the destruction of the second Temple, and the popular heroes of the Babylonian captivity such as Baruch and Ezra took the place of the men of hoary antiquity; and in the Geonic times the great martyrs of the Bar Kokba war became the bearers of the heavenly mysteries. At all events, the belief in secret lore entrusted only to the few initiated, was persistently maintained throughout the centuries, as is shown by a comparison of Dan. VIII, 26; XII, 4, 9; Enoch 82, 1; 43, 10; 104, 12f., and 4 Ezra 14, 2b; 47 with *Ḥagigah* II, 1; *Meg.* 3a, with reference to the Targum of Jonathan b. Uziel; or with *Cant. R.* I, 29, 'the secret chamber of Behemoth and Leviathan called also the chambers of Paradise' (*Agaddath Shir ha-Shirim*, ed. Schechter, 13, 99), 'the secrets of the Merkabah and of the Messianic end' (*Pes.* 56a; *Ket.* 111a; *Sanh.* 97b).

Almost all Jewish authors agree that this entire secret lore known as *מעשה בראשית* and *מעשה מרכבה* (*Ḥag.* II, 1), the theophany and the cosmogony as well as eschatology, formed the monopoly of the Essenes and their select successors (see Frankel, *Zeitschr.*, 1846, p. 457; *Monatsschr.*, 1853, p. 72; Graetz, G. J., III, 494f.; Jost, G. d. *Judenth.*, I, 212; Herzfeld, G. V. *Is.*, II, 408; Leopold Loew, *Mafteah*,

67). Ben Sira, III, 20-23, quoted in *Ḥagigah* II, 1, obviously refers to this secret lore. That there exists a close relationship between Essenism and the Apocalyptic books has been especially shown by Jellinek in the introductory notes to his *Beth ha-Midrash*; see II, XIII^f., XVIII; III, XX, XXXII, and elsewhere.

Of Christian writers it was Hilgenfeld who in his work *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 1857, pp. 243-86, endeavoured to prove the close relations of the Essenes to the Apocalyptic literature, and if he had recognized the real meaning of the name *Essaei* or *Essenes* (the one corresponding to the Hebrew **הַשְׂמִי'ם** 'the men of silence,' the other to **צְנוּעִים** 'the discreet ones'), he would have more strongly adhered to this view later on, when he was misled by his critics to the assumption of foreign elements in Essenism on account of Josephus's sensational suggestions. Lucius partly endorsed Hilgenfeld's view in his work *Der Essenismus*, 1881, p. 109^f., and the theory was further elaborated with especial reference to the beginnings of Christianity by an English scholar John E. M. Thomson in an interesting, yet rather antiquated work, entitled *Books which influenced our Lord and His Apostles*, Edinburgh, 1891, pp. 12, 110, and elsewhere. That the apocalyptic lore formed the essential elements of nascent Christianity, and especially of the Messianic conception of Jesus, is to-day generally admitted, owing chiefly to Baldensperger's book, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, which has gone through several editions since 1888. All the more strenuously is the connection of Essenism with the apocalyptic literature denied by many Christian writers of to-day, as is specifically done by Baldensperger. It is quite characteristic, then, that Charles, in his work on Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian Eschatology, ostensibly avoids the very name of the Essenes, and, instead, speaks of the 'Chasids' of the Maccabean period, 'the forerunners of the Pharisees,' as 'the authors of these prophetic or rather deutero-prophetic works,' 'the champions of the higher theology in Israel.' In describing their character he uses the following glowing terms (pp. 171-3 of the second edition): "Though first appearing as the champions of the Law against Hellenizing Sadducees, they were still more the representatives of

advanced forms of doctrine on the Messianic Kingdom and the resurrection. To this comparatively small body of men was entrusted for some decades the defence, confirmation, and development of the *religious truths that were to save the world* (the Italics are mine). How nobly and with what prodigal self-sacrifice they proved themselves worthy guardians of this sacred trust is told for all time in the Enoch and Maccabean literature. Through their agency the spiritual aspirations of the Old Testament became in the course of a century the unshakeable conviction of Palestinian Judaism." And here the author has in the second edition of the work—which is on the whole a reprint of the first—an entirely new chapter on Prophecy and Apocalyptic (173–206), which is of special interest to the Jewish reader. Here the claim is set forth that the apocalyptic lore 'while built upon the ancient prophecy, was the result of the same psychical experience and concerned with the same object, the future of life, but it had a larger scope than the latter, it being universal and unlimited as to time, having an infinitely wider view.' 'It sketched in outline the history of the world and of mankind, the origin of evil, its course and inevitable overthrow, the ultimate triumph of righteousness and the final consummation of all things. It was in short a Semitic philosophy of religion, and as such it was ever asking: Whence? Wherefore? Whither? and it put these questions in connection with the world, the Gentiles, Israel, and the individual. Apocalyptic, and not prophecy, was the first to grasp the great idea that all history alike, human, cosmological, and spiritual, is a unity—a unity following naturally as a corollary of the unity of God, preached by the prophets.' 'Only by reason of the completion of the Biblical Canon, which implied the cessation of prophecy, pseudonymity was resorted to by the writers, which condition,' says our author, 'changed with the rise of Christianity.' Thus in emphatic contradiction to the view of Jewish scholars who 'have denied to apocalyptic its place in the faith of pre-Christian orthodox Judaism'—a view which he declares to be 'absurd' and a 'blunder'—our author claims 'the existence of *two* forms of Pharisaism in pre-Christian

Judaism, i. e. the apocalyptic and the legalistic.' The former, he says, 'has given birth to, and shaped the higher theology of Judaism and became, historically speaking, the parent of Christianity'; the latter 'drove the apocalyptic from its position of secondary authority and either banished it absolutely, or relegated it wholly into the background, and so arose Talmudic Judaism.'

Obviously Dr. Charles wanted to offer in this additional portion of the second edition of his work the keynote and central idea of his whole book, which was to present an exhaustive exposition of the entire development of Jewish eschatology as emanating from the prophetic concept of 'the day of Yahveh' with the view of having it culminate in the appearance of Jesus the Christ as the fulfilment of the prophetic hopes 'made world-wide by the apocalyptic writers.' Now, while there are here and there valuable observations presented in the book, the author makes himself rather guilty of an egregious 'blunder' when he ascribes to 'the older Pharisees', 'the Chasids', 'the spiritual children of the Scribes,' the belief in their own power of prophecy, after these very Scribes, or Soferim, had declared (see Psalm LXXIV, 9 and Tos. Sota XIII, 2) that with the death of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, the power of prophecy, or the holy spirit, ceased. As a matter of fact, only the Essenes still believed in the continuous working of the spirit of prophecy, as is learned from Josephus (B. J., II, 8, 12; I, 3, 5; III, 8, 3. Comp. B. Wisdom VI, 25). Moreover, if anything may be termed 'absurd', it is to assume that the later Pharisees should have forgotten the very existence of the books rated so highly by the former, particularly when we consider that these apocalyptic writings appeared at the time when the schools of Hillel and Shammai 'the fathers' of Talmudic lore, the contemporaries of King Herod, and that of Johanan ben Zakkai at the close of the Temple period flourished. Surely the most superficial glance at the history of Jewish literature of the time would have convinced our author of his erroneous construction of Judaism, and shown him that what he calls legalistic Judaism, that is, the Halakah, had its counterpart in the Agadah, which contains the free and popular discussion of

the same human, cosmological, and eschatological problems that form the substance of the apocalyptic literature, and offers the same wide outlook upon the world. Indeed, we find here occasionally—compare, for instance, Hagigah 14b, Suk. 28a—the same psychical experiences, ecstatic visions and auditions of Pharisean leaders as the apocalyptists had. Only authoritative power was denied in the schools to such mystic forces (see B. M., 59b.: No regard is to be given to the heavenly voice, for it is said: "It is not in heaven," Deut. XXX, 12). As a matter of fact, Pharisaic or Soferic Judaism in placing the book of Daniel among the Hagio-grapha, denied from the very start its prophetic character, and consequently could not ascribe to the books of Enoch and similar writings based on the visions of Daniel any kind of prophetic or 'deutero-prophetic' character. Thus the whole theory of Dr. Charles falls to the ground.

F. Crawford Burkitt in his luminous lectures on Jewish and Christian Apocalypses approaches the subject with more fairness. The following fine remarks, pp. 5-6, are worth quoting: "The wise men of Israel who came after Ezra had the Law already, but it was they who brought the Prophets into the form in which we read them, and the Psalms, whatever ancient fragments they may probably contain, were in the main their work. To the Prophets it had been given to make the Religion of Israel, but the Scribes made the Bible. It is difficult, when we think of the immense effect that the Old Testament has had, to find words high enough to describe the importance of the work of the Scribes for after generations. And yet it was secondary and derivative. The Scribes had not in themselves the direct and masterful authority that belonged to the Prophets who went before them. They were not commissioned themselves to say: 'Thus saith the Lord.' And so, when the crisis came, we find a new phenomenon. The Jew who feels himself to have a new message for his brethren shelters himself under a pseudonym. The original literature of the two centuries and a half that preceded the capture of Jerusalem is either anonymous, or it professes to be the work of some 'worthy of old time.' It is difficult to know in particular cases how far the pseudonymity was an under-

stood literary artifice and how far it was really deceptive. What I think is clear, is that both authors and readers believed that, if any Revelation from God was true, it could not be new. It must have been given to the great Saints of antiquity." Especial stress is laid, p. 7, and rightly so, on the fact that 'in Daniel there is a philosophy of universal history'; 'there is something cosmopolitan about his outlook upon the world.' 'Judaism is to the author of Daniel a cosmic world-religion.' 'The Kingdom of God—that is the central idea.' But then, claiming that with Christianity the new age predicted by Daniel (and the other apocalyptists) had come, Dr. Burkitt discriminates in favour of the New Testament Apocalypse ascribed to John the Divine, the writer of the letter to the seven Churches of Asia, claiming that he comes with 'a new message given to the contemporary seer' and no longer pseudonymic. This is an uncritical attitude. The apocalyptic portion there as well as those in Matthew 24 to 25 were simply taken over from Jewish sources. Another erroneous statement is made by Dr. Burkitt when he differentiates between the time before and after the capture of Jerusalem, ascribing 'the renunciation of the apocalyptic idea' to Johanan ben Zakkai and his school (p. 12). He finds this in a very sagacious interpretation of the controversy between R. Akiba and Johanan ben Zakkai in Gen. R. XLIV, 25,² where R. Akiba, in explaining the words **בְּיוֹם הַהוּא** in Gen. XV, 18 after Isa. XXV, 9, says, God revealed to Abraham both this world and the world to come, whereas R. Johanan ben Zakkai referring to Zech. XIV, 9, says, only this world was revealed to Abraham. R. Akiba, as the ardent adherent of Bar Kokba, worked, he thinks, in the spirit of the Apocalyptists, for the immediate establishment of the Kingdom of God by the expected Messiah, while Johanan ben Zakkai was, 'when the destruction of Jerusalem was sealed, to guide Jewish thought and religion into new channels, and thus to create the reformed Judaism of Jamnia and Tiberias.' Dr. Burkitt certainly tries to be just in his estimate of Pharisaism when he says (p. 15): "The work of Johanan ben Zakkai and his successors was quietly heroic, and they succeeded so well in their reorganization of Judaism that their work stands to this

day. But . . . they were able to carry their work through, just because they had dropped the conviction that had produced the apocalypses. That is the reason why these documents, speaking generally, were preserved in Greek, and not in Hebrew; by Christians and not by Jews." He forgets, however, that the Ezra and Baruch Apocalypses emanated, as has been shown by F. Rosenthal (*Vier apokalyptische Bücher aus der Zeit und Schule R. Akiba's*, 1885), from these very schools before the Hadrianic war. The concluding words of his first lecture are also dictated by a spirit of fairness when he says: "The nation left two successors, the Christian Church and the Rabbinical Schools, each of which carried on some national aim. And of the two it was the Christian Church that was most faithful to the ideas enshrined in the Apocalypses, and it did consider itself, not without some reason, the fulfilment of those ideas . . . The new age which they announce proved when it came to be different from what the Apocalypstists taught, not only of the great movement which they heralded, but also of the unconquerable hope in the future to which they testify." On the whole, Dr. Burkitt casts no more light upon the authorship and the sources of the Apocalyptic literature than does Dr. Charles.

Oesterly, in his *Introduction to the Book of Enoch*, pp. viii-xi, goes much deeper into the motive and inner working of the Apocalyptic writers, pointing chiefly to the supernatural that plays a great part in the whole literature, which deals so much with other-worldly forces. He correctly describes them as world-fleeing visionaries 'who received their message in some fantastic guise,' unlike the large class of Pharisees. Especially striking is the emphasis laid by him on their 'rigid predestinarianism'; their absolute conviction that the whole course of the world was predetermined by God Almighty before all time. 'This,' he writes, 'was a fundamental postulate of the Apocalypticists who devoted much of their energy to calculations based upon the close study of prophecy as to the exact period when history should reach its consummation.' 'But all these things were divine secrets hidden from the beginning of the world, but revealed to God-fearing men to whom was accorded the faculty of

peering at the hidden things of God; upon these men was laid the privilege and the duty of revealing the divine secrets to others, hence their name, revealers.'

But Oesterly fails to see that this is exactly what Josephus says of the Essenes (*Ant.*, XIII, 5, 9; comp. XVIII, 1, 3-5). While the Pharisees hold that certain things are predetermined by destiny and certain things by human power, the Essenes 'declare destiny to govern all things and that nothing happens but is so decreed (by divine Providence).' This is not, as Bousset (*Relig. des Jud.*,² 533) says, a 'fatalistic view altogether foreign to the legalistic spirit of Judaism.' To a certain extent Pharisaism also voiced the doctrine of predestination in such sentences as 'No bird is caught in the snare without heaven's decree' (*Gen. R.* LXXIX, 6; comp. *Matt.* 10, 29), or 'No one bruises his finger here below, but it has been decreed in the world above' (*Ḥul.* 7b). Only Pharisaism would not allow an interference with man's freedom, as stated by Akiba הכל צפוי ודרשות נתונה (*Abot* III, 19). It denied any one living after the three last prophets the power to foresee and foretell the future (*Tos. Sota* XIII, 2; *Sota* 48b; *Yoma* 9b), whereas the Essenes claimed to possess such power, 'being trained', as Josephus states (*B. J.*, II, 8, 12) 'to use holy books, different modes of sanctification and prophetic utterances (for this purpose), and it is but seldom that they miss in their predictions.' Instances of this are given by Josephus in the case of the Essene Judas under the reign of Aristobulus I, who had 'disciples instructed at the Temple in the art of prophesying' (*B. J.*, I, 3, 5; *Ant.*, XIII, 11, 2), or of Menahem the Essene, a contemporary of King Herod (*Ant.*, XV, 10, 5), the predecessor of Shammai as head of the school (*Ḥagiga*, II, 2; comp. Graetz, *G. J.*, III,⁴ 213, and Geiger, *J. Z.*, VII, 17b). The real character of such prophetic power is best illustrated by what the Agadists tell of Adam as the first man who emanated from the hands of the Creator: he read from God's book in which all things are written, all the events of the future (see *Midrash Teh. to Ps.* CXXIX, 16; *Ab. d. R. N.* XXXI, *Pesik. R.* XXIII; *Sanh.* 38b; *Tanh.*, Beresch., ed. Buber, 29). There is also a significant remark in the *Midrash*

(Gen. R. XLIX, 8): "Before God revealed His counsel to the prophets (Amos III, 7), He revealed it to His worshippers of hoary antiquity (Ps. XXV, 14), and afterwards to the patriarchs, the upright ones" (Prov. III, 32). Exactly this is claimed in the Apocalyptic literature for Adam, Enoch, Noah, and again for the patriarchs and Moses down to Ezra. As Volz in his *Jüd. Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, 1903, p. 5, correctly says: "Apocalyptic is secret lore (Geheimwissenschaft) received from heaven and kept in books hidden by the wise" who keep the secrets (Dan. XII, 4, 9; 4 Ezra 12, 37f.; 14, 6-7; 45-47; comp. Aeth. Enoch 109, 12-13; 17, 3; Slav. Enoch 24, 3; B. Jubilees, 7, 38; 12, 27; 45, 16, see Charles, who regards the book as an Esoteric Tradition (Introd. L; so is *Assumptio Mosis* named also *Secreta Moysi*, Charles, Introd. XLV). But so were the Essenes keepers of secret lore, a 'mysterienverein,' as Bousset, l. c., 532, calls them, pledged 'by a fearful oath' to guard the sacred books of the order and not divulge or alter their contents (Josephus, B. I. II, 8, 7). And the contents of these 'writings of the ancients' (τῶν παλαιῶν συντάγματα (II, 8, 6; comp. Philo using the same terms regarding the Therapeutae, II, 475), that is the books ascribed to the men of hoary antiquity, are by no means of merely a magical character, as Bousset, l. c., thinks, but especially the cosmological or cosmogonic and the celestial mysteries known in Rabbinical literature as מעשה מרכבה ומעשה בראשית (Ḥagig. II, 1), and chiefly so the eschatological secrets. According to later Rabbinical views, however, these were either withheld from every mortal (Shab. 138b; Pes. 56a; Mid. Lekah Tob. to Deut. XXIX, 28), or all these calculations concerning the 'end' were deprecated and declared to be deceptive (Sanh. 97a, b, 99a; Meg. 12a; comp. Cant. R. II, 18-19). Yet it is exactly upon such calculations from prophetic utterances (Dan. IX, 2) after certain world periods and jubilees that the apocalyptists based their predictions. Whether these world periods were taken over from Babylonia or from Persia, it was certainly only in these esoteric circles that calculations concerning 'the end' (Dan. XI, 31, 35; XII, 9, 13) were made.

But it is noteworthy that G. Behrmann in the Introduction

to his very valuable Commentary to Dan. XXV-XXVI, comes to the conclusion that the book was written *within* and *for* the esoteric circle of the Hasidim who were admonished to await patiently the divine help without any human interference (Dan. VIII, 25; comp. II, 30). This is exactly what Josephus (Ant., XVIII, 15) says of the Essenes, that 'their chief doctrine is that all things should be left to God.' These Asideans of the Maccabean books kept apart from the Pharisees, as Wellhausen, *Pharisäer u. Sadducäer*, p. 79f., has shown. Yet these are the very ones from whom the Essenes emanated, and 'the whole literature of the Essene order' to which Josephus refers is none other than the Apocalyptic literature.

In order that the holy spirit of wisdom should come over them and prepare them for divine revelations or visions, Daniel (IX, 3f.; X, 12) and Ezra (4 Ezra 5, 13ff.; 9, 23f.) spends days in fasting and prayer, and for the same purpose the Essenes abstained from all sexual intercourse (Josephus, B. I. II, 8, 2), exactly as the people of Israel in preparation for the Sinai revelation were told 'not to come near a woman' (Exod. XIX, 15), and when afterwards they were told 'to return to their tents,' Moses was to remain with God 'to receive the Law' (Deut. V, 27-28), this being understood to refer to abstinence from conjugal life enjoined upon Moses (see Targ. Yer. to the passage; Ab. d. R. Nathan II; Shab. 87a; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, III, 2). Accordingly, the Midrash (Sifre Num. 99) tells that, when Eldad and Medad have become prophets, Zipporah, the wife of Moses, exclaimed: "Woe to the wives of these men!" inasmuch as they were no longer to have intercourse with their husbands (comp. Enoch's state of virginity when having his visions, Enoch 83, 2; 85, 3; and Apoc. of John 14, 4). Such a state of sanctification was deemed necessary by the Essenes for the receiving of the spirit of prophecy and the invocation of the Name of God for the performance of their miraculous cures, but must not be taken as the acceptance of the monastic principle of celibacy, or as mere misogyny, as Philo II, 638 and Josephus, l. c., want to make the reader believe. In fact, Philo expressly tells us (II, 632) that the members of the order were 'all full grown men and

already verging upon old age, such as are no longer carried away by the vehemence of the flesh nor under the influence of their passions, but in the enjoyment of genuine and true liberty.' Also later on, when speaking of those who have reached a feeble old age, he uses the significant words: "they spend their life in happiness, even if they happen to be childless." More explicitly he says of the Therapeutae, the Egyptian branch of the Essenes (II, 474), 'Abandoning their property . . . they flee, without turning back, leaving their brethren, their children, their wives, their parents, their numerous families, their affectionate friends, their native lands in which they have been born and brought up.' And this world-flight he frequently extols as the means of obtaining a holier state of the soul, when referring to Enoch (II, 410), to the Levites (I, 238, 559), or to himself (I, 81), and those who are to receive the mysteries of Moses and of Jeremiah, 'the prophet and hierophant' (II, 147-8).

This strange world-flight of the Essenes who had settled apart from all Palestinian civilization in the fertile palm region of En Gedi near the Dead Sea, became a particular object of wonder to the non-Jewish world which was especially interested in the asphaltum and the apobalsamum derived from the neighbourhood. Hence spread such fantastic descriptions as are given by Pliny (N. H. V, 15), Dio Chrysostomus (Synesias Dio Chr. IV-V), and others, after an older common non-Jewish source (see Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, 32), according to which this Essene colony, isolated from the rest of the Jews and recruited ever anew by newcomers eager to live like them in a state of celibacy, remote from the world, had its existence there from a remote antiquity 'since thousands of centuries,' 'a perennial nation' as Pliny says, or 'a blissfull commonwealth,' as Dio Chrysostomus puts it. Puzzling as is the fact that no reminiscence of this undoubtedly ancient colony of Essenes at En Gedi is found in Talmudic literature, while the locality famous for its costly apobalsamum (Shab. 28a) was well known to the rabbis, we must take notice of a remarkable Jewish tradition clustering around 'the fertile land of Jericho' which seems to cast some light upon the record in Pliny. It is the oft-repeated Midrashic story concerning the sons

of Jonadab, the Rechabites of the Kenite tribe, kinsmen of Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses (Mek. Yithro 2, p. 62; Sifre Num. 78, 81 and Deut. 352; Ab. d. R. N., XXXV, ed. Schechter, 105; Yalk. Judges I, 16; Sota 11a; Tem. 16a), according to which Joshua at the division of the Holy Land assigned the fertile portion of Jericho 'the city of the palms' to the sons of Jonadab the Rechabite, who occupied it until the Temple of Solomon was built in the territory of the tribe of Benjamin. Then they generously left it to the Benjamites and went to the plain of Arod in the South-land to become saintly devotees of the Law under the leadership of Jabez, the saintly one, who, according to the rabbis, was none else but the Judge Othniel the son of Kenaz. Of course, this agadic legend, based upon the narratives in Judges I, 16; 2 Kings X, 15-23; Jer. XXXV, 2-19; 1 Chron. II, 55 and IV, 9-12 (where the LXX and Targ. preserved the original רכב for רכה), has no historical value in the form in which it is presented; nevertheless it rests upon certain facts which are merely ante-dated. Certain it is that the sons of Jonadab the Rechabite occupied a distinct place among the patrician families of Judea during the second Temple, where they had a special day appointed for the offering of kindling wood for the altar (Taan. IV, 5); they are identified with 'the families of scribes,' the inhabitants of Jabez. In identifying the Essenes 'Jessaioi' with the sons of Jonadab the Rechabite, Nilus, the Mount Sinai monk of the fifth century, quoted by Hilgenfeld (Ketzer-gesch., p. 138f.) obviously followed Jewish traditions such as we find in Pesik. R. 31, where they are spoken of as living 'in the land of Sinim' (Isa. IL, 12) in the South, according to the Targum, to be brought back with the ten lost tribes and especially the sons of Moses (Num. R. XVI, 15; Yer. Sanh. 10, 29c; Ber. 7a; Targ. Y. to Exod. XXXIV, 10). They are probably the Elders of the South, וְקִנֵּי הַנֶּגֶב, who are said to have answered the ten questions propounded to them by Alexander the Great (Tamid 31b-32a, b; comp. Frankel, Zeitscher., 1846, p. 400). One of these 'sons of the water drinker', בְּנֵי שׁוֹחֵה מֵיִם, as they are called, is especially recorded (Mek., l. c.) as having offered a sacrifice at the temple to call forth a special

'voice of heaven' in their praise, since, living outside of the holy land, they would as a rule offer no sacrifices. Before they moved to the South, where they left traces partly legendary, partly historical, until modern times,³ they seem to have merged with the Essene colony at En Gedi, and given it a peculiar character. So they regarded, next to the name of God that of Moses the legislator as inviolably sacred (Josephus, B. I. II, 8, 9).⁴ This Essene colony at En Gedi seems to have some historical connection with the assembly of the Elders or the Wise Men near Bet Gedi in Jericho, who heard a heavenly voice (Bat Kol), declaring one in their midst to have been worthy of receiving the holy spirit—the person referred to being understood to have been Hillel (Tos. Sota XIII, 3; Yer. Sota IX, 24b; Horayot III, 48c; Sanh. 11a). Still it is rather difficult to make this more than merely conjectural, as the text varies in the various sources.

To come back to the main point, the whole complexion of the apocalyptic literature points to circles remote from the seat of Pharisaic or Soferic Judaism, to a class of men, who, living rather on the borderland of Judea, were brought more in touch with popular traditions and foreign currents of thought, such as Babylonian and Persian systems offered, and were therefore induced to create altogether new systems of thought. Especially the books of Enoch, which were of determining influence upon the rest, betray a familiarity with the geographical conditions of the land around the Dead Sea and along the Jordan river, which indicates the dwelling-place of their authors to have been in that neighbourhood rather than in any of the cities of Judea. Thus, the hot springs of Calliorrhoe to the East of the Dead Sea to which King Herod resorted for his cure (Josephus, B. I. I, 33, 5), or of Machaerus (eodem, VII, 6, 3), are spoken of as having been brought to that state by the subterranean fires of Gehenna (Enoch 67, 5–11)—a view re-echoed also in the Talmud (Shab. 39a). Still more clearly does the story of the fallen angels, who had their meeting-place upon Mount Hermon and whom Enoch found weeping at Abel Maim near the waters of Dan (Enoch 13, 7–9; comp. 2 Chron. XVI, 4; 2 Sam. XX, 14f.), betray a familiarity with

the ancient folklore clustering around the sources of the Jordan and scarcely to be found in the schools of the Scribes. As a matter of fact, the whole story of Enoch and the fallen angels appears to be a survival of ancient Semitic mythology of which the verses in Gen. VI, 1-4 form but a fragment. Especially Mount Hermon, the top of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon mountains, seems to have been originally 'the sacred seat of the old pagan deities', as the term *הרמון* indicates, and later on turned into a sort of Semitic 'Blockberg' (Sepp, Jerusalem u. d. Heilige Land, II, 324).⁵

What is true of the books of Enoch, is no less true of the Book of Jubilees, where the story of Enoch and the fallen angels is likewise related, though only briefly; and also of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, where the heavenly tablets of Enoch are constantly referred to as in the Book of Jubilees.

But there is another important point to be considered in connection with the apocalyptic lore, and that is the strange solar system of a year of 364 days presented by the Ethiopic book of Enoch (chaps. 72-82), and in a more elaborate form in the Book of Jubilees (6, 28-38), which is in direct contradiction to Jewish tradition, which adhered to the lunar calendar of the Scripture.

As a matter of fact, this could only be offered by such as formed an opposition to the authority of the Scribes. As was suggested by Abraham Eppstein, quoted by Charles, B. Jubilees, p. 55, note, the underlying idea seems to have been to build up a chronology based on the heptade of months, years, and jubilees. Yet this again points to the Persian idea of the seven millennia referred to also in other apocalyptic books such as the Slav. Enoch, 33, 1, the Book of Adam and Eve, p. 42, and the Assumptio Mosis X, 12 (where the text has been tampered with by Christian copyists), and echoed also in the Talmud (Sanh. 97a; comp. Midr. Teh. Ps. XC, 17). Such calculations are alluded to also in Syr. Apoc. Baruch 56, 2. This entire eschatological and cosmological system, with its angelology and demonology, is the product, not of the Scribes or of the Pharisaic schools, but of a special class of men who kept in touch with Persian and cognate lore and shaped an esoteric Jewish

lore in adaptation of the views and methods prevalent in the same. Only from such secluded circles as the Essenes were, not confined to the land of Judea and rather eager to enlarge their theological system by borrowing from other religious doctrines and practices, or mysteries, could the apocalyptic lore with its hosts of angels and demons and its peculiar concepts of heaven and hell emanate, so as to remain more or less the monopoly of the few, and of the mystics of the Talmudic and Gaonic period. The eschatological lore is characteristically called, 'the mysteries of God' which were not to be divulged (Tanḥ. Wayeḥi, 9 ed. Buber, comp. Midr. Teh. Ps. CXIX, 38). But especially instructive are the words in Midr. Tanḥ. Waera 4, which contains a reminiscence of these apocalyptic writers in the following words: 'The tribe of Levi was free for study (לְטַרְיָא, the Greek *θεωρία* = 'contemplation'), and so Pharaoh said to Moses and Aaron: "You only make the work hard for the men, to which they should cling, instead of listening to the vain words contained in the scrolls which are offered to them from Sabbath to Sabbath to comfort them by the message of the coming divine redemption"' (comp. Apoc. Baruch 86, 1 and 77, 12).

It is easy to see why these apocalyptic writings were rejected by the Pharisaic schools, while a large part of their contents was appropriated by them. Already Ben Sira III, 19-24 says that secret lore is only for the humble, but warns against intruding into the hidden things which are beyond men, as it leads them astray. So does the Mishnah Hag. II, 1 most emphatically deprecate such prying into what is above and beneath, or what was before and will be thereafter, and it directly forbids such teaching in public, that is to more than one or two worthy disciples, of the theophanic and cosmogonic lore; and the Amoraim (Babli Hag. 13a; Yer. Hag. 77c) refer directly to this passage in Ben Sira as the source. In regard to the eschatological mystery the Midr. (Tanḥ. Wayeḥi 9) refers to the verse in Proverbs XXV, 2: "It is the glory of God to conceal a thing," to which also the Mishnah in Hagigah seems to allude.

Over against the whole attitude of the Essenes who believed in resorting to supernatural interference through

miracles and invocations, the Pharisean leaders based themselves upon the Scriptural words: "It is not in heaven" (Deut. XXX, 12) (see B. M. 59b), their purpose being to bring religion within the domain of human life. For the same reason they discouraged all apocalyptic predictions based upon the pre-deterministic view of the Essenes as hampering men's freedom of action and self-reliance. Moreover, while Essenism and the Apocalyptists were chiefly concerned with the Messianic Kingdom and the world to come, taking the pessimistic view such as is expressed in 4 Ezra 7, 3: "Many are created, but few are saved"—which has its parallel in the Testament of Abraham (11, and Matt. 22, 14), and also in the opinion voiced by the Shammaites against the Hillelites: טוב לאדם שלא נברא משנברא 'It were better for man had he not been created than to be created' ('Erubin 13b)—the predominant view of the rabbis is optimistic. As it is expressed by Nahum of Gimzo, 'All is for the best', and likewise by Akiba (Ta'an. 21a; Ber. 60a; comp. R. Jacob in Abot IV, 22). The whole point of view of the Essenes and the Apocalyptists is, like that of the New Testament, other-worldly, whereas that of the Pharisees was rather this-worldly, as may be learned from the saying of R. Meir, "Even death is 'good'" (Gen. R. IX, 5; comp. 18-13), and Hillel's view (Lev. R. XXXIV, 3) that the human body should be honored as the dwelling-place of the Divine Spirit. Pharisaism aimed at making of the Law a religious democracy, following the maxim: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children" (Deut. XXIX, 28). Essenism with its world-contempt and secret lore, as voiced in the Apocalyptic literature, could only appeal to the few. It was a preparation for the Kingdom of God; hence the Essene and the New Testament morals were "to exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and the Pharisees" (Matt. 5, 20), such as found expression in the latter part of Enoch (99 to 108), which is also the source of the Beatitudes and Woes of the New Testament (Matt. 5 and 23, and Luke 6).

DOSITHEUS, THE SAMARITAN HERESIARCH, AND HIS RELATIONS TO JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES AND SECTS

(A STUDY OF PROFESSOR SCHECHTER'S RECENT PUBLICATION)

SINCE the discovery of the Hebrew Ben Sira by Professor Schechter in 1897, then Lector of Talmud at Cambridge, England, the Cairo Genizah treasures have yielded a number of documents which cast new light upon entire periods of Jewish history. The first part of the Documents of Jewish Sectaries just published by the Cambridge Press, edited, translated, and accompanied with copious notes and an Introduction by Professor Schechter under the special title *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, will in all likelihood, as was stated by Professor Margoliouth in the London Athenaeum of November 26, "outrank his other publications in general importance and interest." Not because, as the latter thinks, it has anything to do with the early Judaic phase of Christianity. There is absolutely nothing in the document to support this conjecture except the fact that the Messiah is represented as 'the teacher of righteousness' and that his followers are spoken of as 'those who entered the new covenant' at Damascus. There is no reference whatsoever to either baptism or any other Christian practice or doctrine. On the contrary, the whole sacrificial system with all the Levitical laws of purity connected therewith, the most rigid observance of the Sabbath and the dietary laws are insisted upon throughout the messianic manifesto, so as to offer no ground whatsoever to ascribe it either to followers of the Nazarene teacher who with such scathing language condemned all this ritualism, or of John the Baptist who wanted the cleansing of man from sin by the water of repentance, not by blood. Still more far-fetched is the idea of identifying 'the man of scoffing,' filled with the spirit of Belial, with St. Paul, as the foe of the sect in question is charged with having seduced the people to crimes such

as polygamy and other crimes of a sacrilegious and socio-political nature that can have no reference to the austere and world-despising apostle of the heathen.

In one respect, however, Professor Margoliouth's criticism is correct. Professor Schechter's interpretation and conception of the document failed to take account of 'the personal note' that runs through it and finds its expression in 'the frequent use of the well-known Hebrew form of 'Hearken ye unto me!' which seems to prove that the document was composed at the time of the religious events it treats of.' On reading it we cannot help being impressed by the powerful appeal with which the leader, or rather leaders, of the movement address themselves to the adherents of the sect, while denouncing in vehement language their mighty adversaries who obviously are under the leadership of a politically strong and influential personality. In the form of a ringing, fierce protest, which tells of the presence of the dreaded powerful personality, they lay down the principles of belief and practice they are bound to maintain by the oath of their 'new covenant' in opposition to those of their antagonists.

The learned editor correctly assumes that the work of which the Genizah harbored the fragments of two recensions, one of small extent assigned by him to the tenth, the other of more extensive length pointing to the twelfth century, and which must have been much in circulation at the time in circles sympathizing with the views therein expressed, was identical with the one the early Karaites speak of as Zadokite in character and origin and as known to Anan, the founder of Karaism, who made good use thereof. Nor is it merely accidental that a mutilated fragment of Anan's main work, *Sefer ha Mizwoth*, which forms the contents of Professor Schechter's Second Document, was found in the Genizah alongside of the other. Unfortunately, however, Professor Schechter allowed himself to be misled by Kirkisani and other writers of the tenth century² to make of Zadok, after the old unhistorical method, a heresiarch and—in opposition to Geiger's well-known theory accepted by Wellhausen, Schürer, and other eminent historians—construe a history of the Zadokites, the Dositheans, and the Falashas full of glaring contradictions and based upon opinions held by

Beer, Frankel, and Wreschner which do not bear closer scrutiny, as will be seen in the course of this article. This attitude appears all the more strange as in his Introduction to Ben Sira (p. 35) Professor Schechter called attention to the fact that the mention of the priestly house of Zadok in the prayer fully corroborated Geiger's theory as to the character of the Sadducees in the pre-Pharisaic period to which Ben Sira belongs.

Indeed, eight years ago Professor Schechter was far nearer the truth, when, in a conversation with the writer, he spoke of the Dosithean character and origin of the manuscript he had brought from Cambridge. The very opening words of the document show it to have been the messianic pronunciamiento of the Samaritan heresiarch, as, in direct opposition to the messiahship of David, the king of Judah, it announces: "The sprouting forth of a Messiah from Israel and Aaron," elsewhere 'from Aaron and Israel' (see pp. 1, 12, 19); that is, from the Samaritan line of the priestly house of *Zadok*—a phrase strangely misunderstood by the editor (Introduction, xiii, note 6). No less clearly is the Samaritan character of the messianic pronunciamiento brought out at the very outset, when it speaks of 'the End of the Wrath' having arrived at the close of the 490 years (so correctly emended by the editor with reference to the 70 weeks of years in Dan. IX, 2, 24) after Nebuchadnezzar's overthrow of the nation (586 B.C.). For not only do the Samaritans divide their history into an era of divine favor and one of divine wrath,³ but they alone could look upon the second temple period as a continuation of the era of wrath. Only when in the year 63 B. C. Samaria was for a short while liberated from the dominion of Judea by Pompey, could an era of divine favor have been looked for, one to be brought about by a Messiah from their own midst. And exactly as John Hyrcanus had been declared the priest-king of a higher order predicted in Scripture,⁴ so could the messianic claim be raised by a priest of the more legitimate house of Zadok. Of course, we must not expect messianic calculations to be based upon exact chronology. Suffice it to know that we are brought down to the former half of the first pre-Christian century which witnessed the rise of the Pharisean party to

power under the leadership of Simeon ben Shetaḥ, the brother of Queen Alexandria Salome, 'the man of hot hands,' the unrelenting, uncompromising foe of the Sadducees,⁵ and, no doubt, dreaded and cursed by the opposing party as no other leader. And, while we have no date even approximately to place Dositheus, the founder of the new Samaritan sect, we have every reason to believe that his being known as the first heresiarch, who had some relationship to the mythical founder of Sadduceeism, indicates that it is just this turbulent period in Jewish history in which he appeared on the scene as the antagonist of the Pharisees and their powerful leader.

Before analyzing our document, let us consider the meaning of the epithet used to designate the party assailed in the book: *bone hayiz* (pp. 4 and 8). The word cannot mean 'builders of a fence,' as translated and explained with reference to Abot I, 1: '*asu seyag la-Torah*, 'Build a fence around the Law,' as our document also insists upon having a fence around the Sabbath (p. 10). Compare our further remarks on the passage. Taken from Ezek. XIII, 10, the word signifies 'builders of a hollow partition wall,' and is an apt nickname for the Pharisees whose separatism is declared to be pretentious and hollow.⁶ Against these separatists and their leader, Simeon ben Shetaḥ, called 'the scoffer who pours forth water of deceitfulness,' who 'filled with the spirit of Belial drags the people by his teaching into the threefold snare of fornication, of greed, and of desecration of the sanctuary,' is directed the fierce arraignment (pp. 4, 8, and 20). Particularly is the latter charged with having fomented discord and strife and caused the people to transgress the laws concerning sexual purity, the Sabbath and festivals, and those of righteousness. Nay more. He made them enter an alliance with the pagan rulers concerning whom God said: "Their wine is the poison of dragons and the head of asps that is cruel."⁷ This head, says the document, refers to the 'head of the kings of Javan who came to execute vengeance upon them.' A glance at the history of the time and at the Psalms of Solomon⁸ leaves no room for doubt that this refers to the dearly-bought Roman friendship which ended in the submission of Judea to the rule of

Pompey, who could well be called the 'head of all the kings of the Macedonian empire.'

Here we have then the historical background for the messianic movement also among the Samaritans, who saw one pretender after the other rise, especially after Herod had brought Samaria again under Judean dominion.⁹ We can also understand that, since Damascus formed the headquarters of Pompey during his invasion of Judea, the Samaritans who fled from their capital should have found a safe refuge in the vicinity of the northern city.

THE SAMARITAN MESSIAH

The Samaritan literature as well as the Samaritan creed has scarcely received the attention it deserves at the hands of Jewish scholars, owing to the national prejudice voiced in many parts of the Talmud against them, just as the Karaites labored under the same difficulty. Both sects, like all heresies, simply represent an arrested growth; and it can easily be shown that the Samaritans retained Agadic and apocalyptical views as well as Halakik doctrines which were afterward rejected by the Pharisees, or rabbis, in the course of their historical progress. Their oldest literature, their liturgy, and their folklore are saturated with the same ideas and views as are the Pseudepigrapha and the later rabbinical Midrash or Targum literature. Their apotheosis of Moses had its parallel among the Essenes and is simply pre-Talmudic and Hellenistic. Concerning the messianic hope we only know that they saw in Deut. XVIII, 15 the prediction of a Moses-like prophet to come and be the teacher and law-giver of the people. So we are told by Origen with reference to John 6, 14-15.¹⁰ He is their Taëb, 'the one who comes back.'¹¹ But he is also called 'the Star' (op. cit., 35) with reference to the prophecies in Num. XXIV, 11-18, the messianic character of which is emphasized both by Josephus¹² and Philo.¹³

The appearance, however, or rather the recognition of the Messiah when he appeared, depended in those times chiefly upon a chronological calculation.¹⁴ This is the reason why the chronological and calendar system with its Jubilees

plays so great a rôle in eschatology, and it was held to be a 'secret lore.'¹⁵ Following the Persian system of belief, the apocalyptic writers placed the messianic era at the end, or the middle of the sixth millennium so as to have the *seventh* as the world-Sabbath.¹⁶ As a prominent feature of the approaching advent of the Messiah is mentioned also the increasing power of the spirit of the Evil One, called Belial, Satan, or Angramainyus (Armillus) whom the Messiah is to 'slay with the breath of his lips.'¹⁷ The great world-drama ends with the final triumph of the Messiah over Belial and his Satanic hosts.¹⁸

THE MESSIAH OF THE DOSITHEAN SECT

We are now prepared to listen to the claims put forth in our document for its 'Messiah from the house of Aaron and Israel,' and to see whether we are justified in identifying him with the Samaritan heresiarch. As stated above, we have before us a messianic pronunciamiento in the form of a personal appeal but incomplete, owing partly to the defective state in which it was found, partly also to unskilful copyists who, either through carelessness or because they desired to make only an excerpt of the whole work, omitted a great deal and disarranged it so as to put it into disorder. The beginning, however, and also the end of the work seem to have been preserved. Regarding the latter, the editor failed to see that pp. 19 and 20, though containing matter presented in the former part, form the conclusion of the work and do not belong before p. 9, as the translation (pp. xxxix-xliv) has it. The appeal begins:

Hearken unto me, all ye who know righteousness, and meditate on the doings of God. For He will have strife with all flesh and execute judgment upon all who despise Him. Because of their faithlessness with which they forsook Him He hid His face from Israel and His sanctuary, and delivered them to the sword. But remembering the covenant with the former generations He left a remnant to Israel, and did not exterminate them. And now at the end of the wrath, 490 years after He had delivered them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, He remembered them and caused the root of His planting to sprout forth from Israel and Aaron to take possession of His land and to rejoice in the good of His soil. And they meditated over their sin and knew that they were guilty men, and for twenty years they were like blind

groping in the way. Then God considered their deeds, for they sought Him with a perfect heart, and He raised for them a teacher of righteousness to make them walk in the way of His heart. And He had made known to former generations [read *ha-rishonim*] what He shall do [read *Yaaseh*] 'in the last generation' (Deut. XXIX, 21) to an assembly of treacherous men who turn away from the path. Indeed, this is the time concerning which it has been written: "As a backsliding heifer, so did Israel slide back" (Hos. IV, 16), since has risen the Man of scoffing who has poured forth unto Israel waters of deceitfulness, and caused them to wander about in the pathless wilderness, to bring low the heights from of old, and to turn away from the paths of righteousness, and to remove the boundaries which former generations set to their inheritance so as to make cleave to them the curses of His covenant (Deut. XXIX, 20) and deliver them to the sword that is to execute the vengeance of the covenant (Lev. XXVI, 25).

It is to Pompey's invasion of Judea which brought defeat upon the Pharisees that these strong words allude. But the appeal continues (p. 2), addressing "those who entered the covenant" in truly apocalyptic style, pointing to the great cosmic battle fought between the powers of evil 'which ever ensnared men since the days of the oldest generations [read *dorot Kedem*], that is Cain and his line of descendants, and the Watchers before the Flood' and those 'who are written down in God's book as His friends and the men of His covenant to whom the years of the End and the secrets of the Sabbath and the seasons were revealed.' It is the same point of view which is taken by the Books of Enoch, the Jubilees, the Book of Adam in its pre-Christian form, and similar works that find expression in the rather obscure text which requires emendation now and then in order to be intelligible. Just as Moses found in Jannes and Jambres—see the art. in J.E.—the workers of magic, plotters of mischief, so does the 'teacher of righteousness' encounter the evil powers of Belial in the dreaded Pharisean leader. This is the leading thought pervading the introductory part. The concluding part likewise is apocalyptic in its nature. It dwells on the great day of Judgment when God will, as is described by the last of the prophets (Mal. III, 16ff.): "Let His glory shine upon the righteous who remained steadfast to the Law and the covenant which they renewed at Damascus" and "are written in His book of remembrance as fearing Him and thinking upon His name,"

but deliver the wicked and those that have broken the covenant which they have entered anew to destruction through the hand of Belial, and pour out his wrath upon the princes of Judah. All those who have been faithless to the new covenant and have no share in the house of the Teacher (read *Bet ha-Moreh*, p. 20, l. 13), whose names are not counted in the council of the people and not inscribed in the book, will not come safely out of the fiery ordeal.

In accordance with this apocalyptic system which Samaritan writers of the fourth and the twelfth centuries, in common with the authors of the Books of Enoch and the Jubilees and all the Essene writers, believed to have come down from the patriarchs as tradition from Noah, Shem, and Adam, our Manifesto endeavors to establish the messianic claims of its Moses-like teacher upon Scriptural texts, in contrast to those held forth by believers in a Messiah from the house of David. Not David, who in having many wives did not observe the law (Deut. XVII, 17) nor even read it, as it remained hidden away in the ark from the time of Joshua until a (son of) Zadok rose (II Kings XX, 22), and, as it was disclosed, there were also disclosed (read *we-nigalu*) the evil deeds of David (p. 5, ll. 2-5). No. In Zadok God built up for the sin-laden

a faithful house in Israel the like of which never arose before and hitherto, they who hold fast to Him for the life of eternity and all glory of man is theirs, as God confirmed it to them through the prophet Ezekiel when He said (XLIV, 15): "The priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok that kept the guardianship of My sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from Me they shall offer Me fat and blood." The priests are those of Israel who have returned of those who departed from the land of Judah; the Levites are those who 'joined' them, and the sons of Zadok are the chosen ones of Israel called by name who rise up at the end of days. Behold, their names are distinctly given after their genealogy together with the end of their rising up and the number of their sufferings and the years of their wanderings and an exposition of their doings until to the end [read *ad kēz ha-shanim*] when they will have no longer any share in the house of Judah (pp. 3-4).

Omitting the rest, which is given in defective form, we learn from these lines that the sect laid great stress upon a genealogy of the house of Zadok, and that their followers kept a book containing their traditions as to the messianic hope and their chronological system, exactly like the one

frequently referred to in the various Samaritan chronicles in our possession. This book our Manifesto mentions in its concluding part (p. 19, last line) with reference to Ezek. XIII, 9—a verse connected also by rabbinical tradition with the *secret lore* of the calendar and the *ordination* of the teachers of the Law.¹⁹ It is the following verse, by the way, which suggested to the writers of the Manifesto the name 'Builders of the hollow partition wall' for their Pharisean antagonists given them in the lines that follow. That the priestly families kept genealogical lists tracing their pedigree back to the remotest time is a fact attested to by Josephus (*Contra Apionem*, I, 7).

In contradistinction to 'the law-giver from Judah' (Gen. II, 10) which forms the basis for the Pharisaic claim, our Manifesto points to Num. XXI, 18, where 'the law-giver' is mentioned in connection with the well which the princes of Israel have digged, the passage also being referred to 'the Interpreter of the Law and those of Israel who, having returned, departed from Judah and settled in the land of Damascus, remaining true to his teachings, waiting until he, the teacher of righteousness, will again appear at the end of the days' (p. 6). Many prophetic passages containing a rebuke or condemnation of the people of Judah and of Israel, such as Isa. VII, 15; VIII, 15, and particularly Hosea, are profusely quoted, or utilized, in the Manifesto. But one passage in Amos V, 26-27, in which God saith: "I will lead you as exiles beyond Damascus," furnished an especially opportune text on which to base the doctrines of the sect: "Ye shall carry the protection of your King"—this is the Torah—'Your King'—this is the people (cf. Prov. VIII, 15); 'the pointing out of their idol-worship'—this refers to the books of the prophets whose words ancient Israel had held in contempt; and 'the Star'—this is the Interpreter of the Law who has come to Damascus, the one of whom Scripture (Num. XXIV, 17) says: "A star will come forth from Jacob and a scepter from Israel"—that is the prince of the whole congregation who, when he appears again, "shall smite all the sons of Sheth." We have here the exact traditional messianic interpretation of the verse adopted by the Samaritans.²⁰ In all probability the original Manifesto contained more

explicit allusions to the personality of the 'Star,' the 'Messiah,' and 'Teacher,' whose line of ancestry went back to Zadok, the high priest, and to Aaron. All that we now learn is that he was also given the name *Yahid*, 'the only one,' or "the only one teacher" (p. 20, ll. 1, 14, 32), that he died in the vicinity of Damascus, and that his followers waited for his return (7, 20; 12, 24; 19-20). Whether the peculiar name *ha-Yahid* was given him in view of his martyrdom with reference to Zechariah XII, 10, "the mourning for the only one," is difficult to say.

Now as to the use and recognition of the prophetic books by a Samaritan sect, we will have to modify the accepted view of this. The writers of our Manifesto regarded them, in common with the ancient rabbis, as 'words of tradition'²¹ alongside of the Torah, exactly as they did all non-canonical books. It is the doctrinal side that gives us a true insight into the messianic movement. As a restorer of the Law, 'the teacher of righteousness,' no doubt with a view to the name *Zadokite* which was interpreted 'follower of righteousness,'²² the Messiah of our Document, shows all the unyielding rigor which characterized only one heresiarch known to Jewish and Samaritan history, namely Dositheus. However much the various Patristic and Samaritan writers may differ in regard to the chronological date and other matters pertaining to the life of this 'first of the heresiarch,' as he is called, they agree as to his teachings relative to the Sabbath, the purity, the dietary and marriage laws having been extremely rigorous and inimical to all contact with the heathen world; so that there can scarcely be room for doubt that we have his teachings before us. The name *Ilfan*, which, as Shaharastani tells us,²³ Dositheus bore, besides that of 'the Star' and the Prophet predicted by Moses (Deut. XXIII, 15), is the Aramaic word for 'teacher.' Shaharastani places him at about the century preceding Christ. This is confirmed by Origen (op. cit.), who also tells us that his adherents who preserved his books believed that he "did not taste death but continued to live in some form." According to Epiphanius (Haeres. i. 13) he was a learned Jew who from disappointment went over to the Samaritans, and that at the end of his career he retired into a cave where he

died of voluntary starvation. The best information about the Dosithean doctrines have been preserved by the Samaritan historian Abul-Fath, which, while making allowance for inaccuracies due to hearsay reports, we cannot fail to recognize as in the main identical with the laws contained in our Document.²⁴ More will be said later anent his changing the festivals by introducing the solar calendar with 30 days a month.

Reminiscences of the name *Yahdu*, to which Schechter refers,²⁵ and of his writings have been preserved in later legends which represent Dositheus as having been compelled to flee for some offense and as having carried his books with him to Suweika near Jerusalem, which seems to be a confusion with the town Kokaba near Damascus. Sources hostile to the Dositheans represent him as 'a descendant of the mixed multitude that went with Israel out of Egypt,'²⁶ or as a son of Palti (Palpul—Balaam?), the chief magician in Pharaoh's time who plotted harm against Moses.²⁷ Kokaba as the seat of the Dosithean sect is mentioned in the Midrash in connection with a dispute R. Meir had with a Dosithean of Kokaba.²⁸ The name Dositheus, corresponding to Nathaniel or Mattanyah, is frequent in pre-Christian times. Possibly the name of the village Kokaba has some connection with the settlement there of Dositheus, 'the Star' (*Kokab*), and it is scarcely a mere incident that the mythical founder of the Ebionite sect was also supposed to have lived there.²⁹ Julius Africanus³⁰ speaks of Kokaba near Damascus as one of the Jewish villages whither the relatives of Jesus had fled. The majority of writers maintain that the Dositheans denied resurrection, just as did the Sadducees, the mythical founder of whose sect, Zadok, is brought into historical connection with Dositheus.³¹ The belief in his reappearance has, in fact, nothing to do with the belief in resurrection; it must be regarded rather as the characteristic feature of the Messiah who is supposed to disappear and to reappear,³² which is also a Samaritan doctrine.³³

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SECT

On investigating the constitution mapped out in our Document, we cannot be in doubt that we have before us the social conditions of the first pre-Christian century as they then prevailed in Judea. The community was composed of four classes, viz.: priests, Levites, common Israelites, and proselytes. The last ones, to whom the Psalms (CXV, 13; CXVIII, 4) and the Liturgy (the Eighteen Benedictions) accorded a special rank in the pre-Christian time, were not represented in the administrative body of Ten, which consisted of 4 priests and Levites and 6 common Israelites selected as Judges of the community ('*edah*'). They were to be familiar with the 'Book of Public Reading' (*Sefer-ha-Hagoh*), that is the Torah scroll written in the ancient Samaritan letters, the loud reading of which, especially with regard to the ineffable Name, required an expert,³⁴ 'and also with the fundamental principles of the Covenant' (that is the Interpretation of the Law adopted by the sect at Damascus as forming 'the New Covenant'). They had to be between the ages of 25 and 60 years, not older, as, says the Document with reference to Jubilees 23, 11, pointed out by the editor: "Owing to God's wrath against the generations after the flood the human intellect fails in old age."³⁵ These judges had the power to inflict capital punishment, or banishment, on the members of the sect, but only in conjunction with the two heads of the community (p. 10).

The community being divided into smaller settlements, camps, or towns, two men were to be placed at the head of each containing a congregation of ten members of the sect (cf. Sanh. 2a), the one a priest who likewise had to be familiar with the Book of Public Reading, the acknowledged authentic Torah scroll, and of the age between 25 and 60. In case no priest possessing the required knowledge was found, a Levite was to take his place.³⁶ His function was to keep the genealogical records of the members of the settlement and to pronounce the final decision of the Law, especially also to declare the uncleanness of the person or house infected with leprosy (Lev., chap. XIII). The other

one called *Mebakker*, 'inspector' (that is 'examiner' or 'overseer,' not 'censor,' as Professor Schechter translates it),³⁷ held the more important office of instructor and supervisor. He had to be consulted even by his colleague, the priest, in all matters pertaining to Levitical purity;³⁸ he had to examine the status of each member as to his fitness and proper position, and had to administer oaths; he had the power to impose penalties for offenses, or to condone them and readmit the penitents; also, in conjunction with the general Board of Administrators, to assess the members as to their dues for the support of the poor or the priests. Exactly like the *Episcopos* ('overseer') of the Essene, afterward the Christian 'Congregation of God' (Didascalia, II, 20, 24), he is 'to show compassion for all as a father for his children and tend to their needs as the shepherd of his flock, rescuing from the hand of the insolent the oppressed and the crushed.' 'Without the inspector's permission no member of the camp is allowed to bring anyone into the congregation, nor shall anyone have commercial dealings with the [sons of the] merchants [read *bene ha-Sohërim* or *Ba'ale ha-Sehorah*], if this be by a pledge from hand to hand, nor shall he establish a partnership [read *heber*; cf. Job XL, 30] for mercantile purposes, unless he inform the inspector of the camp that he may establish the mercantile league [read *heber ha-miknah*].' The entire paragraph, the meaning of which escaped the translator, receives its light from the statutes concerning the oath to be administered by the inspector, preserved only in fragmentary form (pp. 13-15).

At the head of the entire community was to be placed a higher duumvirate consisting of a priest equipped with greater knowledge and ability as well as authority to bind all together, and a chief inspector 'familiar with every form of secret discourse of men and every language, symbolic or plain.' He has the final decision in every dispute, and he superintends, in conjunction with the Board of Judges, the charity, 'receiving from the well-to-do a share of their monthly earnings and distributing the same among the poor, the aged, the homeless, and those who are without protection' (p. 14).

Presumably the ten judges and the two chief magistrates

resided in what is called 'the City of the Sanctuary,' a place set apart as most holy and containing an altar for the regular sacrifices.³⁹ In this sacrosanct place sexual intercourse was prohibited.⁴⁰ Each camp or town, however, had a house of worship of its own into which none but the Levitically pure were permitted to enter (p. 11; cf. *Die Canones Jacob's von Edessa*, ed. Kayser, Leipzig, 1886, 11, 80).⁴¹

Now it is to be noticed that the institution of a duumvirate ruling over the community is found only during the first and the second pre-Christian century in Judea and was, as is shown in Geiger's *Urschrift*, (115-19), originally Sadducean and only afterward transformed, or adopted, by the Pharisees in the well-known Pairs (*Zuggot*).

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL JURISDICTION

Likewise the civil and criminal laws point almost with certainty to the Jewish and Samaritan conditions and practices of the pre-Christian century. Owing to the lamentably defective state in which the Document is found (14-15), we can make out only the following part of the statute: "No one shall take an oath either by the four-lettered Name, or by any other name such as Elohim or Adonai." Instead, the oath at the court, or when new members are to be admitted into the community, should be administered by the inspector as 'an oath of the covenant which Moses established with Israel' and sworn to 'by the curses of the covenant' (Deut., chaps. XXIX, XXX; cf. Sanhed. 39a), and the violation of such an oath was avenged by death. Similarly the Essenes, who otherwise refrained from swearing, administered 'oaths of an awful character upon any new member to be admitted into their community,' and like the Samaritans and Dositheans⁴² they well-nigh apotheosized Moses.⁴³ The passage in Yer., Sanh. 10 : 28b, quoted by Schechter referring to the Samaritans does not say that they were in the habit of taking an oath by the Tetragram; on the contrary, as is amply evidenced by Geiger,⁴⁴ R. Mana points to them as avoiding the Tetragram and using *ha-Shem* or *Shema* ('the Name') instead.⁴⁵ The Pharisaic courts insisted, however, on an oath by God's name.⁴⁶

It is exactly in the time of Simeon ben Shetaḥ that we are placed by the law 'on the recovery of lost goods' [read *al hashabat Abedah*, 9, 1. 8]: "He hath said 'Thine own hand shall not help thee.'" ⁴⁷ "Therefore he who administers an oath [of proclamation] in the open field and not in the presence of the judges or their by-standers [read *Ma'amadam*], his hand has helped him"—that is, he cannot by right keep the goods he found. This obviously refers to the institution recorded in Yer. *Ta'an.*, III, 66d, and Babli, B.M., 28b, in connection with an utterance of Simeon ben Shetaḥ concerning the "Stone of the Litigant," *Eben ha-To'ën*, ⁴⁸ a stone in the midst of the city of Jerusalem upon which lost goods were deposited by the finder to be handed over to the owner after due proof of his claim, or after an oath had been taken by him. The statute continues: "If anyone has lost a thing, and it is not known who stole it from the storehouse [read *Meod*] of the camp, the owner shall administer an oath of proclamation by way of a curse, and whosoever hears the same and, knowing the matter, will not tell, he shall be guilty [Lev. V, 1-6]. And if the lost goods have no claimants, all goes to the priests who keep it until the owner is found" (p. 9).

Another interesting point is that "a man who has been seen by a single witness and then by another one committing a certain sacrilegious act, he is by the decision of the inspector expelled from what is called the 'sphere of purity.'" In similar manner the *Episcopos* in the Didascalia II, 16, is told to 'cast out the offender with severity, just as Miriam was shut out of the camp seven days for her offense, God having said to Moses: "If her father had but spit in her face, should she not be ashamed?"' This is what the rabbis termed a divine 'rebuke' (*Nezifah*) with reference to this very passage in Num. XII, 14. ⁴⁹ The camp in which God's majesty dwelt was not to tolerate in its midst any of those unclean by sin. ⁵⁰ But like the *Episcopos* of the Didascalia, the inspector can readmit the offender after he has shown sincere repentance.

"No one," says another statute, however (p. 9), "shall hand over as excommunicated a man from his brethren [read *meeḥav*], to have him put to death after the statutes

of the Gentiles, for concerning him it is said [Lev. XIX, 18]: 'Thou shalt not avenge, nor hold over any wrath against the children of thy people'"—which verse is taken in the sense of a prohibition against handing over for punishment any Israelitish man to non-Israelites. This prohibition against recognition of the jurisdiction of Gentile courts ('*arkaot shel goyim* or *Agoraot shel nokrim*; note the Greek terms *ἀρχαι* and *ἀγοραί*) is derived by the rabbis from Exod. XXI, 1,⁵¹ and likewise is found in Didascalia, II, 45, whence also I Cor. 6, 1ff. The warning not to resort to self-revenge, but to leave the vengeance to God—which is based in the Epistle to the Romans upon Deut. XXXII, 35, a passage read differently by the Samaritans—is founded in our Document on Nahum I, 2; and Lev. XIX, 17 is pointed to as forbidding to give vent to fierce wrath instead of offering kind rebuke. Throughout the Document the lesson of brotherly love, of fostering peace by open rebuke, and of helpful support to the needy is voiced with reference to Lev., chap. XIX, a chapter which formed the basis of Jewish ethics and of the Jewish propaganda literature.⁵²

THE LEVITICAL LAWS OF PURITY AND SANCTITY

On the other hand, there is the spirit of inexorable austerity displayed in all the laws concerning Levitical purity and sanctity as well as of the Sabbath that are so characteristic of Sadduceeism and Samaritanism. Ewald, already,⁵³ when speaking of the Dositheans, called attention to the name *La Misas* ('Touch me not!') given to the Samaritans, which gave rise to the legend of Samiri who as the maker of the Golden Calf was cursed, another Wandering Jew.⁵⁴ The Samaritans were not less, but a great deal more, scrupulous than the Pharisees in regard to these and other Mosaic laws, as was admitted by the early rabbis.⁵⁵ Consequently the statutes concerning the purificatory bath, 'the waters of which should not be drawn from a vessel and must be sufficient to envelop man's whole body,'⁵⁶ or that 'they should not come in direct or indirect contact with impure things' (10); as well as the law declaring that vessels may serve as conductors of uncleanness in the house where a dead body

lies (12); or that the projecting part of a tomb makes him who stands beneath it unclean—this seems to be the meaning of the obscure sentence in Abul-Fatḥ concerning the ‘shadow of a grave’—are all derived from temple practice and of Sadducean origin.⁵⁷

Also in regard to woman in her menstruation or after her confinement, the Dositheans, like the rest of the Samaritans, represent the rigorous Sadducean view;⁵⁸ and so they accuse the Pharisees who considered the principles of human dignity and of domestic happiness to be of greater importance than Levitical purity which concerns only the priesthood,⁵⁹ of ‘polluting the sanctuary’ (p. 5, l. 7). In this connection it is interesting to notice that the Book of Jubilees⁶⁰ lays great stress on this very law in Lev. XII, 1, of woman’s purification in connection with Eve’s entrance into Eden’s sanctuary, thus echoing the ancient Sadducean, not merely Samaritan, view. Of course, the later Mishnah authorities judge, or misjudge, the Samaritans from their partisan point of view; concerning them all sorts of slanderous reports were then circulated,⁶¹ which the believer in the Talmudic Halakah is of course bound to accept as true.

LAWS CONCERNING HEATHEN

Quite significant is the attitude taken by the Dosithean law toward the heathen. The Pharisean teachers, in their endeavor to broaden the Torah into a great universal truth, wanted to have the temple at Jerusalem, in the spirit of the prophets and the Psalms, rendered a center of worship, provided for and accessible also to the nations of the world, as may be learned from Suk. 55b.⁶² Accordingly they teach against the letter of the Law (Lev. XXII, 18–25) that vow-offerings brought by a heathen or a wicked Israelite may be sacrificed upon the altar in order to win the one *over*, and the other *back*, to God;⁶³ only those of apostates would they exclude, with reference to Prov. XV, 9: “The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination.”⁶⁴ Our Document (p. 11, l. 18) points to the same verse while declaring: “No man shall send to the altar burnt-offering, or meat-offering, or frankincense, or wood, through the hand of any man made

unclean by any of the uncleannesses to allow him to make the altar unclean." The same verse is quoted in the Talmud⁶⁵ with the view to prohibit prayer in an unclean spot, or with an unclean body, or after a nocturnal pollution, which last prohibition formed the chief motive for the custom of the Hemero-baptists and Essenes. Accordingly also our Document continues: "And whosoever enters a house of worship shall not enter it when he is unclean without⁶⁶ washing."

Of historical interest are the following statutes (p. 12, ll. 2ff.): "Any man over whom the spirits of Belial⁶⁷ have dominion, and he speaks rebelliously, he shall be dealt with by the court like an *Ob* and *Yiddeoni*."⁶⁸ (Is this the same as 'speaking in tongues,' I Cor., chaps. 12-14?) "If, however, he wants to seduce others to profane the Sabbath and the Feasts [espousing the Pharisaic doctrines?] he shall not be forthwith put to death, but watched whether he may be cured. After seven years he may re-enter the Congregation." This implies that he remains thus long excommunicated.

"No man shall stretch forth his arm to shed the blood of any one of the Gentiles for the sake of wealth or gain, nor shall he carry off anything in their possession so as not to lead to blasphemy" [this is the same as the rabbinical *Hillul ha-Shem*],⁶⁹ "unless it be done by the counsel of the confederation of Israel"—that is, in a state of warfare.

"No one shall sell clean cattle or fowl to Gentiles, lest they may sacrifice them" (to their idols; cf. Abod. Zar. I, 5). "Nor shall he sell anything from his threshing-floor or his wine-press at any of their feasts [read *bekol Mo'edehem*, and cf. Ab. Zar. I, 1]. Nor shall he sell them his male slave or female slave who have entered the covenant of Abraham with him."⁷⁰

THE LAWS CONCERNING THE SABBATH

Most instructive for the study of the entire process of development of the Mosaic law is the chapter devoted in our document to the Sabbath, of the desecration of which the Pharisees are again and again accused. Geiger, whose well-known researches have cast new light upon the his-

torical process of Judaism by showing the close relationship of Samaritanism and Karaism to Sadduceeism, calls special attention to a remarkable passage in the Mishnah, Hag. 1, 8,⁷¹ which reads as follows: "The rules concerning the annulment of vows float in the air and have nothing to support them; the rules concerning the Sabbath, the pilgrimage sacrifice [*Hagigah*] and sin-offerings for breach of faith are like mountains suspended by a hair, having but few scriptural, and all the more numerous Halakik expositions!" The former part of these rather perplexing strictures will be discussed later on. The remark about the Pharisaic Sabbath laws, however, concerns us here, as it is a rather naïve criticism of the artificial system of the Pharisaic Sabbath legislation, which has a list of thirty-nine chief kinds of work prohibited on that day. These are based upon the analogy of specific works required for the tabernacle,⁷² without even taking due cognizance of express Scriptural prohibitions such as buying and selling.⁷³ Neither trading nor riding on horseback is regarded as work forbidden by the Law; both are merely forbidden by the rabbis for the reason that they may eventually lead to a direct transgression of the Law, the one to do some writing, the other to cut a branch off the tree for the sake of obtaining a whip.⁷⁴ There is ample evidence, however, that during the Maccabean time a far more rigorous view of the Sabbath prevailed, as is learned not only from the books of the Maccabees, but also from a record preserved in the Talmud,⁷⁵ showing that riding on horseback was punished by the court with stoning to death. In fact, the older Halakah represented by the rigorous Shammaites⁷⁶ insisted on the same principle adhered to by the Samaritans, that no work should be begun on Sabbath eve which is not entirely finished at the entrance of the Sabbath, whereas the liberal school of Hillel made ever new concessions for the sake of 'rendering the Sabbath a delight,'⁷⁷ laying down the principle that 'the Sabbath is given over to you, not you to the Sabbath.'⁷⁸

Against these Pharisaic innovations, which created the fiction of the '*Erub*'^{78a}, the duty of kindling the Sabbath light⁷⁹ and similar things (B.K. 82a) and permitting work to be done by Gentiles in cases of need, there came the pro-

testations of the exponents of the old Sadducean law as voiced in the Book of Jubilees, according to which it is forbidden under the penalty of death 'to prepare anything to be eaten or drunk that had not been prepared the day before, to draw water, to bring in, or take out any burden through the gate, or to have any intercourse with one's wife,⁸⁰ to set out on a journey, to transact any business; also to ride on a beast, or to travel by ship on the sea, to strike or kill anything, to catch an animal, or to fast, or to make war on the Sabbath.'⁸¹ These same prohibitions are stated in 'the Sabbath Commandments of the Falashas,'⁸² and there is added thereto 'to have a quarrel with, or to pronounce a curse against, anyone on Sabbath, or to rise from the seat and turn aside to ease nature.'⁸³ It is accordingly the old Sadducean standpoint from which the Sabbath laws in our Document are written (pp. 10-11). We give them here in full, while at the same time endeavoring to elucidate some of the obscure points:

"No one shall do any work on the sixth day from the time when the sun's disk is still at a distance from the gate of its entering [read *Meboo*]; for He hath said: 'Guard the Sabbath day' " [Deut. V, 12]. This interpretation of the term *shamor*, 'guard,' in the sense of making a fence around the law in order to prevent its transgression is not only accepted by the Karaites, but based upon ancient tradition (see M.K. 5a; Yebam. 21a; W. B. Levy, s.v. 'Mishmeret'). In fact, it was a long-established priestly practice to have signals given by trumpets from the temple hilltops at the beginning of twilight to stop the people from work (Josephus, B.J., IV, 9, 12; Sukk. V, 5). Accordingly a misplaced paragraph in our Document at the close of p. 11 (found 'obscure' by the editor) reads: "When the trumpets of the Congregation are sounded, whether earlier or later, the people shall cease from work, for it is Sabbath altogether holy."

Our Document continues: "No one shall speak vile and idle speech on the Sabbath day." This is based upon Isa. LVIII, 13 (cf. Shab. 150a). This statute is also found in the Falasha Commandments quoted above and has its striking parallel in the Essene Sabbath prayer preserved in the Apostolic Constitutions (cf. art. 'Didascalia,' J.E., IV, 594, col. i) in which occurs the sentence: "No one should utter forth one word in anger on the Sabbath day, for the Sabbath is given for the study of the Law" (cf. Pesik. Rab., XXIII, p. 121).

"No one shall demand any debt of his neighbor, nor shall he bring a suit in court for any property or gain. Neither shall he discuss matters of business, or work to be done for the following morning. Nor shall anyone walk into the field to watch [?] the work of his affairs on the

Sabbath, nor go out of his city beyond the limit of [two] thousand cubits." This Halakah based on Num. XXXV, 5 (Erub. 50b) is very old (see Josephus, Ant., XIII, 8, 4; Acts 1, 12; cf. Schürer, I, 246; II, 475).

"One shall not eat or drink anything on the Sabbath unless it has been prepared and brought into the camp before." This is based on Exod. XVI, 5. "If one is on the road and goes into the water to bathe, he may drink while standing, but he shall not draw into the vessel." This is based on Exod. XVI, 26.

"No man shall send the son of a stranger to do his affairs on the Sabbath day." Compare the rabbinical view according to which this is not forbidden by the Law (Maim., H. Sh., VI, 1).

"A man shall not put upon himself filthy garments, or such as are brought in . . . unless they are washed in water, or daubed with frankincense." The meaning seems to be that working-day garments which are either dirty or have an offensive odor should not be worn on the Sabbath (cf. Shab. 113a). Schechter's reading *begoy*, by a Gentile, and his interpretation of the statute hardly seems acceptable, as the Levitical impurity ascribed to the stranger (Introd., XV) cannot be removed by rubbing the garment which he brought or touched, with drugs.

"No man shall fast of his own free will on the Sabbath." Cf. besides Jubilees and Falasha Comm. quoted above, Judith 8, 6, and Maim., H. Sh., XXX, 12. Read *Yithr'aab*.

"No man shall walk behind the cattle to make it browse outside of the city beyond the two-thousand cubits." The idea is that like himself his cattle should not pass the Sabbath limit.

"He shall not lift his hand to beat it with his fist, nor remove it with force if it be stubborn."

"No man shall carry anything out of the house or into the house, and standing at the entrance, he shall neither take anything out, nor bring anything in." "No man shall carry about him drugs when going out or in, on the Sabbath." This is also prohibited in the Mishnah, Shab. VI, 5.

"He shall not open a glued vessel on Sabbath." According to the rabbis this does not fall under the category of work, whereas the Karaites also forbid it (see Schechter, notes). "No one shall move about rock or earth in the house on Sabbath." "The nurse shall not carry the suckling child while going out or coming in on Sabbath." So also Mishnah, Shab. XVIII, 2.

"No man shall deliver a beast giving birth to her young on the Sabbath day." So also Mishnah XVIII, 3. "And if one falls into a pit or a ditch, he shall not raise it on Sabbath." Here the rabbinic law, in view of the animal's suffering, is much milder. (See Shab. XVIII, 2; Talmud Shab. 128b; Maim., H. Sh., XXV, 26, and cf. Matt. 12, 11.) "And if any person falls into a gathering of water, or into a ravine [read *ma'amak*], one shall not bring him up on a ladder and with a rope or any other instrument." Here the Pharisaic law differs, declaring

the *saving of life* to be the paramount duty (Yoma 84b; Tos. Shab. XV, 16-17; Mekilta Ki Tissa 110).

"No man shall scold his man-servant or maid-servant, or his hireling on the Sabbath day." So also the Falasha law and Didascalia, II, 47; V, 10, and the Sabbath prayer quoted above.

"No one shall take his Sabbath rest in a place near the Gentiles, staying there over Sabbath." This law is derived, according to Munagga, the Samaritan writer, from Lev. XXIII, 3: "It is a Sabbath unto the Lord in all your dwellings," which is taken to signify that the Israelites should not dwell in a place where one lives who violates the Sabbath (see Wreschner, op. cit., 13). This law was adopted also by *Anan* (see Harkavy, Likute Kadmonioth, 6-7). Wreschner's point of view is a misconstruction of the facts. "No one shall violate the Sabbath on account of wealth and gain." This refers to the preceding paragraph, urging the man of business not to spend his Sabbath among the Gentiles in order to obtain material advantages. "No one shall bring upon the altar [any free will offerings] save the regular burnt-offering of the Sabbath, for it says: Besides the Sabbaths of the Lord [and besides your gifts and all of your vows and all your free will offerings] (Lev. XXXIII, 38). That is to say: the latter are not to be offered on the Sabbath of the Lord.

THE LAWS CONCERNING VOWS

Just as our Document protests against the Pharisaic innovations concerning the Sabbath observance, so it deprecates the laxity with which the Pharisean teachers would annul vows, thereby infringing upon things pertaining to the sanctuary. No doubt, these vows, made rashly in moments of distress and anxiety, which in the early biblical times brought doom on the people, as seen in the story of Jephtah's daughter, and which are deprecated by the author of Koheleth V, 1-5, became matters of serious consideration to the sages who saw the welfare of the people frequently undermined by them.⁸⁴ In view of this the Pharisees boldly declared by way of analogy that, just as the Law in Num. XXX, 1f. empowers father and husband to annul the woman's vow, so shall 'the heads of the tribes,' or the sages, by the power and authority of their wisdom and knowledge, be empowered to annul the vow made by persons with due consideration of the circumstances involved.⁸⁵ This power of 'binding and loosing'⁸⁶ was naturally enough contested by the Sadducees, and so our Document reads (p.16) : "And since the Law says: That which has gone out of thy mouth thou shalt

keep [Deut. XXIII, 25] to fulfil it, any binding oath which a man puts upon himself to perform a commandment of the Law, he cannot make it void not even at the price of death; and if a man takes a vow upon himself to depart from the Law, even at the price of death he shall not fulfil it. And as regards the oath of a woman of which Moses says that her oath may be annulled [Num. XXX, 3-9], let no one annul an oath of which he [the husband] does not know whether [read *im* instead of *dm*] it should be confirmed or annulled: If it be for transgressing the covenant, he shall annul it, and not confirm it. And so is the law also for the father."⁸⁷

THE DIETARY LAWS

The chapter on the Dietary Laws has only two paragraphs in our Document (p. 12); the rest seems to have been omitted by the copyist partly through carelessness, partly for other reasons. They read as follows: "None shall contaminate himself by any [forbidden] wild beast and creeping thing by eating therefrom—from beehives to the soul of any living thing that moves in the water. Fish shall not be eaten unless they were split alive and their blood shed; and all the locusts after their kinds shall be put into fire or water while alive, for this is the manner of their creation." As to their forbidding honey, Schechter (Introd., xxiv) thinks that they regarded it as a part taken from a living animal which falls under the category of the law: "Thou shalt not eat the soul with the flesh" (Deut. XII, 23), which is binding upon the half-proselyte or Noahide as well (Hul. 101b f.); for which reason they forbade, according to Abul-Fath, also the eating of eggs except those found in a slaughtered animal. In n. 20, p. li, Schechter ascribed the reason for the prohibition to a possible mixture of the honey with particles of the bee, considered also by the Karaites in their observation of the law. That the Samaritans were stricter in their dietary laws than the Pharisees is expressly stated in the ancient Baraitha.⁸⁸ As to the prohibition against eating fish and locusts, unless they were killed in the manner prescribed, Munagga, the Samaritan writer,⁸⁹ confirms this law as being Samaritan, while pointing to the fact that Scripture calls both fish and

locusts which have died of themselves 'carcasses' (*Nebelah*) which contaminate the eater. Wreschner's attempt to represent the Samaritans as imitators of Harranian, or Hindoo, practices is dictated by his Halakik view, and is not justified by the facts. It is also to be noticed that Jub. 6, 12 does not include the blood of fish and locusts among the prohibitions mentioned there—a fact which disproves Schechter's theory concerning the relation of the Dositheans to this 'heretical' book.

THE LAWS ON FORBIDDEN MARRIAGES

The laws concerning forbidden marriages are no longer preserved in our Document. The importance assigned to them, however, by the authors of the Manifesto is shown in the introductory part (4-5) in which the charge of 'fornication' is brought against the Pharisees in view of the following facts:⁹⁰

"They marry two wives while both of them are alive, whereas the fundamental law of creation is expressed in the Scripture: 'God created man male and female' [Gen. I, 27], and, going into the ark, 'they went in two and two, male and female' [VII, 9]; also regarding the prince it is written: 'He shall not have many wives' [Deut. XVII, 20]—a law which David did not read in the Book of the Law, it having remained hidden away in the ark, as it remained unopened in Israel from the day of the death of Eleazer and Joshua and the elders all the while the people worshiped the Astarte idols until a Zadok[ite] [II Kings XX, 22] rose and revealed what was hidden and then became known [read *wayegalleh hatamun we-niggahu*] the deeds of David aside from the murder of Uriah, and God left them to him." (The line following, concerning the Pharisaic treatment of the wife in her menstruation was spoken of above.) "And they marry the daughter of their brother or sister, whereas the law of Moses which forbids the man to marry the sister of his mother, declaring her to be the mother's near kin, applies also to woman and consequently forbids also the brother's daughter to marry her father's brother, he being her father's kin."

Now as to the prohibition of marrying two wives while they are both alive—of which, by the way, the Book of Jubilees makes no mention—it is to this very day observed by the Samaritans except in the case of the childlessness of the first wife when the husband has to divorce her.⁹¹ The rabbis also found polygamy to be contrary to the law of humanity.⁹² Nor is it merely the Karaites who adopted the prohibition of polygamy,^{93a} but the early church also prohibited bigamy to the bishop and the deacon⁹³ because it is said (Gen. II, 24), “and he shall cleave to his wife,” and not ‘wives.’

How far back the prohibition against marrying the niece goes, which Anan and the early Karaites adopted, while using the same argument as stated in our Document⁹⁴ cannot be stated for the present. Estor ha-Parhi's view indorsed by Zunz⁹⁵ and Steinschneider⁹⁶ that the Karaites adopted it from the Samaritans and the latter from the Koran (Surah IV, 27) must now be discarded as false. Not only was the prohibition known to be in force among certain sectaries (*Minim*) in the Geonic time⁹⁷ but also the early Christian church had in the Apostolic Canons (Par. xix) the following statute: “He who has married two sisters (one after the other) or his brother's or sister's daughter cannot be a clergyman.”⁹⁸ On the other hand, it is the Book of Jubilees which sets up the rule that each pious man should marry the daughter of his brother or sister;⁹⁹ exactly as does the Talmud,¹⁰⁰ another proof of the fallacy of Beer's and Schechter's theory concerning the relationship of the Book of Jubilees to the Dosithean sect.

THE CALENDAR SYSTEM AND THE BOOK OF JUBILEES

We now come to the one point which seems to support this theory, all the more so as our Document directly refers to the Book of Jubilees under the name of ‘the Book of the Divisions of the Seasons according to Their Jubilees and Their [Year] Weeks’ (p. 16);¹⁰¹ while at the same time the Document teems with verbal quotations from Jubilees, as Schechter's notes sufficiently show. It is the calendar system of the Pharisees which the Manifesto in its introductory

part (p. 3, l. 14; p. 6, l. 18) condemns, while declaring 'its own Sabbaths and festivals to be the revelation of hidden things concerning which all Israel have gone astray.' Exactly so the Book of Jubilees (1, 29; 6, 22-37; 1, 5) has its own system of reckoning the years, the festivals, and the Sabbath dictated from the heavenly tablets by the angel of God's presence to Moses and to Noah with the contention that 'the order of the years and feasts of the people is one of error and of ignorance.' Now, our Document in its present defective state offers no information about the calendar system which it declares to be divinely revealed. All the more light is furnished on the subject by what the Samaritan, the Karaite, and the Jewish sources tell us of the sect called Dosithean by the one and Zadokite by the other. All these agree that the calendar was a solar, instead of a lunar, one, and the months were fixed at thirty days each. This system is presented at length in the Book of Jubilees in connection with the covenant of God made with Noah after the flood where, with reference to Gen. VII, 11 and VIII, 3, 4, 14, 22, the reckoning is made after the solar year and months of thirty days. It assigns 364 days to the year, that is, twelve months each of thirty days, with four intercalary days at the end of the four seasons, and altogether 52 weeks, so as to have each year begin on the first day of the week and all the festivals of each year fall on the same day; hence also the Feast of the Weeks in accord with the letter of the Law (Lev. XXIII, 15-16): "On the morrow of the Sabbath." Only thus, says the Book of Jubilees: "Will the seasons not be disturbed and the feasts of the year not be dislodged."¹⁰² In order fully to appreciate the spirit which prompted this seemingly arbitrary system, cognizance must be taken of the fact that the Mosaic law in the case of the Jubilee year actually counts the new year from the day following the Atonement Day, that is the 11th of the 7th month, and not from the first day. It thus reckons the year after the solar calendar as was done by Ezek. XL, 1.¹⁰³ On the other hand, Sadducean tradition insisted upon having the Pentecost feast always on Sunday in conformity with Lev. XXIII, 15-16, which, according to modern historico-critical exegesis,¹⁰⁴ has no other meaning than 'the

day following the weekly Sabbath.¹⁰⁵ It was undoubtedly on account of their opposition to the Pharisean authorities in Jerusalem, who fixed the calendar by observation of the moon and in accordance with their interpretation of the term 'the morrow after the Sabbath' as signifying the sixteenth day of Sivan, that the Samaritans and the Boethusians, the successors of the Sadducean party, contrived by false signals to mislead the Jewish people in their reckoning of the months. Now the best way of emancipating themselves from the Pharisaic authorities was the introduction of the solar calendar as presented by the Book of Jubilees. Here the Feast of Weeks (*Hag ha-Shabuot*) seems to have been taken in the sense of 'the Feast of the Covenant-Oaths,' being the day on which God concluded the Covenant with Noah, with the patriarchs, and with the people of Israel,¹⁰⁶ and, instead of the fifth or sixth of Sivan,¹⁰⁷ the fifteenth of the third month is given as the festival day.

Now, far from being shunned as one of the 'heretical' books condemned by R. Akiba, Sanh. X, 1, as Professor Schechter represents it in his Introduction, the Book of Jubilees was greatly used by the authors of Seder Olam ascribed to R. Jose of the second century,¹⁰⁸ as well as by other Midrash works,¹⁰⁹ and was still in use in Geonic times.¹¹⁰ In all probability it had a determining influence on the Falashas in Abyssinia, as is especially pointed out by Eppstein in his book *Eldad Ha Dani*; but this is by no means the case in regard to the Dosithean sect whose views concerning the marriage and the dietary laws differ from the teachings of the Book of Jubilees, as has been shown above in contradiction to the assumption of Beer and Schechter.

THE ZADOKITES AND KARAITES

After having thus examined our Document in its entirety, we can only arrive at the one conclusion that the messianic pronouncement and the constitution we have before us in fragmentary form emanated from the immediate followers of Dositheus, the Samaritan heresiarch, who claimed to be the Messiah from the Samaritan line of the Zadokite priesthood and was declared to be 'the only teacher of righteous-

ness' (*Zedek*), as he wanted to have the law restored in full conformity with the view and tradition of the Zadokite priesthood. While in accord with the Samaritan views in the main, he differs from them particularly in regard to the prophetic books, which he recognizes as more or less inspired, rejecting merely the Judaic hopes founded on the Davidic dynasty, while at the same time he makes ample use of the pseudepigraphic literature that seems then to have been widely read, but was lost sight of thereafter in the rabbinic schools. The whole forms an important link in the development of the pre-Talmudic lore, Halakik or Agadic. It strongly confirms the theory of Abraham Geiger as to the relationship of Samaritanism and Karaism to Sadduceeism, which, far from being a mere heresy or sectarianism, represents rather the legal and doctrinal system of the Zadokite priesthood in its unbending adherence to temple tradition and ancient practice, in contrast to the progressive and democratic views of the Pharisees. In attempting to define Sadduceeism as 'a sort of counter-tradition or an interpretation claiming to go back to primitive Judaism' (Introd., xxi, n. 35), Professor Schechter seemingly has altogether forgotten that in his *Ben Sira* Introd., 35, he called attention to the prominence given to the priestly house of Zadok of which Simon the Just was so fine a type, and that he thereby offered the best possible corroboration of Geiger's view of the Sadducees, indorsed by Wellhausen, Schürer, and others.¹¹¹ The story in *Aboth* d. R. Nathan, V,¹¹² of Zadok and Boethus does not represent these two disciples of Antigonos of Soko themselves as founders of the Sadducean and Boethusian sects, but states that their disciples' disciples founded these sects. Only the patristic and rabbinical literature speaks of them as heresiarchs. In the tenth century we are boldly told by Saadia¹¹³ that, in opposition to Zadok and Boethus who wanted to change the Jewish calendar system, Antigonos of Soko and his court of justice instituted the regulation of the festivals by observation of the moon. This is denied by Hasan b. Mashiah, the Karaite, who says the writings of Zadok 'which are generally known' contain nothing on that point. Kirkisani, however, the Karaite who lived also in the mid-

dle of the tenth century, dwells at great length on the works of Zadok, which must then have been widely circulated, and Professor Schechter's scholarly introduction has made it reasonably clear that it was our Document, probably in a more complete form, which passed as the work of Zadok.

Professor Schechter has made it highly probable, if not certain, that the Document brought to light by him formed the very source of Anan's system, or of early Karaism, which, as Kirkisani relates, was founded upon the books of Zadok. The very argument with which Anan in his 'Book of the Commandments' bases the prohibition of marrying the niece upon the Scripture is to the very letter identical with that given in our Document, and thus the whole system of early Karaism of which the amplification of forbidden marriages forms the most prominent part, rests upon the Dosithean work. We thus possess in this Document the connecting link between the ancient Sadducean and Samaritan lore and the doctrines of the Karaites in a far more direct form than Geiger and Harkavy could expect. We now understand better how in pointing to 'Zadokite' books the Karaites could call themselves 'followers of Zadok' and why they were identified by mediaeval Jewish writers, Saadia, Juda Ha Levi, Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, and others, with the old Zadokites.¹¹⁴

But we must go a step farther. The Dosithean work alone passing under the name of Zadok could not well have exerted that great influence upon the Karaites in their reaction against Talmudism, had not a remnant of the Dosithean sect kept alive the Sadducean tradition and directly assumed the more familiar name of Zadokite. According to Photius, the Dositheans in about 600 c.e. held a dispute with the Alexandrian bishop Eulogius, with the result that they were expelled from Egypt. Scattered over the entire East, then, they may have assumed the name of Zadokites and kindled the messianic hopes which finally led to the creation of the sect that called itself 'Mourners for Zion' before it became known as that of the Karaites. The name of Dositheus was forgotten and was preserved only in the quaint legend found in Tanh. Wayesheb and Pirke d. R. Eliezer XXXVIII, telling of Rabbi Dosethai and Rabbi Sabuya, the representa-

tives of the two Samaritan sects, as having been the instigators of the Samaritan schism in the time of King Senaherib and then solemnly put under the ban.

DOSITHEAN INFLUENCE UPON JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN
DOCTRINES AND SECTS

There is nothing in the teachings of the Falashas or in their history to support Schechter's opinion that they had anything in common with the Dosithean sect. Their system, if not altogether founded upon, is at least identical with, that proposed in the Book of Jubilees which, as has been shown, differs in many essential points from the Dosithean Document and looks to Jerusalem as the holy city. The prayers of the Falashas are, in particular, Essene in character and have both Jerusalem and the house of David as the central objects of their hope for the future.

On the other hand there are a number of points in our Document that suggest a relationship to the early Christian church. The Didascalia has been referred to several times in this article, but this was shown by the writer in the Jewish Encyclopedia (s.v.) to have been originally an Essene work. Nor must any stress be laid upon the name New Covenant given to the Dosithean system of Mosaism as accepted by the sect in the land of Damascus. It by no means signifies a new dispensation in the sense the term is used in the New Testament with reference to Jer. XXXI, 31.¹⁷⁵ Another question is whether the term 'New Covenant' did not become known to Judeo-Christians who, as Julianus Africanus tells us,¹⁷⁶ settled in the vicinity of Damascus and thus may have had some influence upon the Paulinian church.

There is certainly a striking resemblance between our Document (p. 19, ll. 7 f.) and the New Testament passage, Matt. 26, 31 and parallels, in regard to the use of the prophetic utterance in Zech. XII, 7. In describing the messianic end of the visitation our Document quotes: "O sword, awake against my shepherd and against the man that is my fellow, says God, smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered," and then continues with reference to Zech. XI, 7

and Ezek. IX, 4 to describe the day of judgment when 'the ones will be marked for life and escape, and the others delivered to the avenging sword.' This same passage is quoted by Jesus during the great night of trial at the Mount of Olives in a rather puzzling manner, and the explanation offered¹¹⁷ is that the dispersion of the followers of Jesus and their flight to the North of Judea is here alluded to. We are here referred directly to the story of Africanus and Hegesippus concerning the men who fled to Galilee and Damascus.¹¹⁸ But there are other indications that the Judeo-Christian sects had come under the influence of the Dositheans. Ebion, the mythical founder of the Ebionite sect, is said to have lived in Kokaba, 'in the Decapolis' where, according to Epiphanius¹¹⁹ the early Christians, called Nazarenes, lived (see Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergesch.*, 428).¹²⁰ How far the story of the star at Bethlehem in Matt. 2, 2 was influenced by the star in Num. XXIV, 17 is rather difficult to say, as the story has many parallels pointing to Persian and Babylonian origins.

More directly the messianic title, 'the Star' in our Manifesto, seems to have influenced that of *Bar Kokba*, the pseudo-Messiah and hero of the Hadrianic war. Opinions differ as to whether his real name was Bar Kokeba ('Son of the town Kokaba'),¹²¹ or Bar Koziba ('Son of Koziba'); all we know is that R. Akiba, the great teacher of Israel, proclaimed him the Messiah, applying to him the messianic verse of Num. XXIV, 17. Hence he was called 'the Son of the Star' until his star declined, and, when defeat came, his name was changed into that Bar Koziba ('Son of Falsehood').¹²² It is strange, however, that both terms Kokab and Ish ha Kazab ('Man of Falsehood') occur in our Manifesto.¹²³ More striking still is the fact that according to Syncellus (quoted in the J.E. article) Bar Kokba was also called 'the only one,' *Μονογένης*, which corresponds with the name given to Dositheus in our Manifesto. The history of Bar Kokba is by no means fully cleared up as yet.

Altogether our Document shows points of contact with many movements in Jewish and Judeo-Christian history, and both historians and theologians will do well to study more closely the important publication of Professor Schechter.

It is to be hoped that the missing parts of the fragment or the more complete work will some day be found and cast further light upon a period which may be called one of the most fruitful in the religious history of the world.

THE HALAKIK PORTIONS IN JOSEPHUS' ANTIQUITIES, (IV, 8, 5-43)

IN SELECTING the Halakik portions of Josephus' *Antiquities* for the subject of my paper I have two objects in view. I want, first of all, to show that there is much material for the study of the history of the Halakah in non-rabbinic literature, and especially in Josephus and Philo, unused by, and scarcely known to, scholars; and secondly, I wish to prove in contradiction to what has been written by Olitzki,¹ Ritter,² Bloch,³ and Weyl⁴ on the subject—that Josephus, instead of presenting, as is generally believed, the results of his own knowledge and experience in this, his systematic collection of Mosaic laws and especially in what he calls the Mosaic Constitution, had before him an older priestly document, similar to that found in the so-called Zadokite Manifesto of Damascus discovered by Dr. Schechter, and, as he did in many other instances, embodied it in his work with occasional alterations, without mentioning his source. (I have exposed this kind of an appropriation by Josephus of an older work quite clearly in my article on the Essenes, which, of course, no scholar has as yet taken the trouble to read with the care and attention the subject demands.) The fact is that Josephus has as yet, to my knowledge, scarcely received the attention of Jewish scholars to the extent he deserves, not as an author, but as a compiler.

To come to my special subject, let me state that the Halakik material presented by Josephus, and partly also by Philo, differs essentially from the traditional view presented in the Mishna and the other Rabbinical literature such as *Sifre*, etc., so that traditionalists like David Hoffman and his disciples reject with more or less consistency the statements of Josephus as based on superficial text interpretation and inaccurate knowledge of facts, or on Alexandrian Jewish practice as recorded by Philo. Ritter is inclined to accredit a large part of what Josephus has to Philo; Bloch, on the other hand, points to the many diversities of opinion

existing between the two, showing Josephus to have worked independently; whereas Weyl went deeper into the whole question by a closer study of the Rabbinic literature. The fact, however, that the statements of Josephus represent an older stage of the Halakah, and that is the priestly practice and therefore, in many respects, still Sadducean, in other words, a middle stage between Sadduceism and Pharisaism, has never dawned upon these writers. This I shall undertake to show.

First of all, let me call your attention to the conditions in which Josephus wrote his books. He was in Rome, far away in time and space from the religious and national life of his people. The Antiquities were written about twenty-three years after the destruction of the Temple. That he should have then still been able to give so exact a record of the judicial and religious practices of his people during the temple time as the one presented in his work without the help of other sources is to ascribe to him a memory and a character which he, to judge from many other indications, did not possess. He was, no doubt, a skilful compiler. He knew how to make the history of the patriarchs and of Moses interesting by inserting everywhere Agadic material derived from older sources, Palestinian and Alexandrian, and embellishing them by speeches and observations of his own. Following, then, the Pentateuch, he described the Sinai Revelation, the giving of the Decalogue, all about the Tabernacle, the Aaronitic priesthood and the sacrifices in accordance with the practices prevailing in the Temple in, or shortly before his time, recording even the Aramaic terminology which he, no doubt, copied from his source. His anachronism is especially shown when he tells (III, 12, 5), of the market-place with shops of all kinds to have been arranged around the Tabernacle such as were the עֲנֵן דְּבִית עֵין against which the Essene saints (Tos. Men. XIII, 21) and Jesus in the gospel, protested. The whole point of view of the description is that of the ruling priesthood. This is especially brought out, when in unison with Philo, (II, 229), he, (Ant. III, 12, 2), states, (after Mangey's correction *φιλῆτην* in place of the senseless *φυλάττειν*), that the high priest must marry a virgin of the priestly family,

taking the word *מַעֲמִי* בחולה in Lev. XXI, 14 in this literal sense, to which the Sadducean practice indubitably adhered, whereas the Pharisaic Halakah in its anti-Sadducean zeal went so far as to allow the high priest to marry the daughter of a proselyte, interpreting the word *מַעֲמִי* to mean from any one who belongs to his nation, and that is to include the daughter of an Ammonite proselyte—*לִהְיוֹת בָּהּ גֵּיטָר עַמּוֹנִית*—(Sifra 95a; Yeb. 77b; comp. Ritter 73, and Heineman in Cohn's Philo Deutsche Uebers. p. 42 note).

Now, at the close of the life of Moses, Josephus gives in the eighth chapter of the fourth book of his Antiquities an epitome, so to say, of Deuteronomy which he calls the Mosaic Constitution of the government, as he says, in more systematic form, but exactly, so he asserts, as Moses had bequeathed it to the people never to be altered. Beginning, like Deuteronomy, with an address to the people, he at once accentuates the fundamental idea of the Deuteronomic legislation, the exclusive holiness of the city which God shall select through prophecy, (comp. *בֵּית הַבְּחִירָה*), and he closes the paragraph by saying: "In no other city should there be either an altar or a temple; for God is but One, and the nation of the Hebrews is but One." He repeats this doctrine, (Contra Apionem, II, 23): "There should be but one temple for the One God, this temple to be common to all, as He is the common God for all." Philo, likewise, (II, 223): "There should be but one sanctuary, as there is but One God." (Also the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, 48, 24, has the same.) But our passage refers also to the uniqueness of Israel, exactly as our Sabbath *Minḥa* prayer and Berakot 6a have it with reference to *אֶחָד גּוֹי יִשְׂרָאֵל*, (Chron. XVII, 21). But stress must be laid on the mention of both altar and temple, whereas the twelfth chapter of Deuteronomy, on which the first paragraph of Josephus' Constitution is based, refers only to the holy city. Obviously the author here, as well as Philo, has in view the temple of Heliopolis, which according to Josephus, (Ant. XIII, 3, 1-3), and the Talmud, (Menaḥot 109b), Onias erected, claiming a legitimate character for the altar, because of the prophecy of Isaiah in XIX, 18, whereas even the Egyptian king and queen declared the undertaking to be a sin against

Israel's God. Now, it is quite remarkable that the Mishnah in *Menaḥot* is not so vigorous in the condemnation of the Onias temple, (XIII, 10), when permitting vows to be performed there, while our passage implies an absolute condemnation, as if the temple were tantamount to a violation of the worship of the One God, such as was the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim in the opinion of the rabbis.

The next paragraph deals with the blasphemer (מגדף) and says: "He who dared to blaspheme God shall, after he has been stoned, be hung upon a tree all that day, and then he is to be buried in an ignominious and unnoticed way." This is in full accord with the letter and the spirit of the Mosaic law, which in Lev. XXIV, 13-16, has stoning by the congregation as the penalty for the *נוקם השם* and *מקלל* and in Deuteron. XXI, 22-23, this law says: "When a capital sin has been committed by a man and he is put to death, and thou hangest him on a tree, his body shall not remain over night on the tree, but thou shalt bury him on the same day, for a curse of God is he that is hanged . . ." The meaning is plain. Not every execution is followed by hanging of the body, but only in the case of heinous offences which call for public disgrace as being a curse, that is, a violation of God. After having been exposed before God and man until sunset the sad spectacle, as Driver well says, is to end, and the corpse to be buried. Exactly this was done by Joshua to the five Canaanite kings, (Josh. X, 26-27), whose bodies were simply thrown into the caves after having been taken down from the trees at sunset; and later on we read of Nicanor that he met the punishment of the blasphemer, and how his body was hung up at the tower before the Temple, whence also the name, The Gate of Nicanor, (II Macc. 15, 32-35). Now, the words *ותליה אותו* by no means make it imperative to hang up the corpse after the execution, as R. Eliezer, (Snh. IV, 4), takes it, as does the Rabbinic Halakah in the case of the blasphemer and idolator. The word *ותליה* forms the protasis, while the law is prohibitive; it forbids leaving the corpse exposed during the night, stating that this token of God's wrath should not be prolonged beyond the same day. There can

be no doubt that the judicial practice as given in Josephus was in force in olden times. The Pharisees, however, changed the whole procedure, and gave the law both in Leviticus and in Deuteronomy an altogether different character and meaning. Contrary to the letter concerning the מקלל they tell us, (Sanh. VI, 4), that the casting down by one of the witnesses of the criminal from the six-yards-high בית הסקילה was the main mode of killing and was sufficient in itself; and only in case he was not dead, must the other witnesses cast a stone upon his heart, and should that, too, fail to kill him, then only should the people stone him to death. It is superfluous to state that this is a direct change of the Mosaic law which says, (Lev. XXIV), ורגמו אותו כל העדה, and in case of the idolator, (Deut. XVII, 5-7), וסקלם. באבנים ומתו . . . יד העדים בו בראשונה . . . ויד כל העם באחרונה. The reason for the change of the procedure of the stoning is given in the Tosefta, (Sanh. IX, 11), by R. Jehuda, and in the Babylonian Sanh. 45a, by the Babylonian Rabba bar Abuhah as the application of the Golden Rule to the criminal: ואהבת לרעך כמוך, ברור לו מיתה יפה, 'Seek for the mildest and most humane form of death for him.' This became the guiding principle for the entire penal law in the Rabbinic Halakah, as any one who reads the Mishnah, the Gemarah and the Sifre can see. And in this sense, Rabbi Meir, (B. Sanh. 46b; and Tos. Sanh. IX, 7), gives for the words, תלוי מלך הוא לאדם ברמות דיוקנו, 'the beautiful illustration of a king whose twin brother is hung as a criminal, and, as the people identify him with the royal brother, the command is given that he should be taken down. So does God treat man as His own image, even when he suffers the severest penalty. The same interpretation of the above quoted words is given in Targ. Yer. and Rashi, עשוי. The Sifre, on the other hand, refers קללת אלהים to the person who cursed God and is therefore hung, מפני מה זה תלוי. Of a disgraceful burial of the blasphemer no mention is made in the Rabbinic Halakah. The Mishnah tells us that there were two separate burial places kept for the two classes of executed criminals; one for the נסקלין ונשרפין and the other for the נהרגין ונחנקין. Speaking, however, of the death of Achan, (Ant. V, 1, 14),

Josephus says that he was buried at night in a disgraceful manner, just as was proper for a malefactor. This additional remark seems to indicate, as has been correctly noted by Weyl, (p. 48f.), that this was the general practice in former times.

In the case of the procedure of שרפה, which is described in Sanh. VII, 2, as having been a burning of the intestines by means of a blazing cord forced down the throat of the criminal, and which punishment is applied to a priest's daughter who was found guilty of harlotry, (Lev. XXI, 9, באש תשרף), Josephus, (§ 23), has the law in exactly the Scriptural sense: Let her be burned alive. But far from this being due to a lack of knowledge on the part of Josephus, we have the undisputed testimony on the part of R. Eliezer b. Zadok. The latter, when still a child and carried about by his father, R. Zadok, at the time the Temple still existed, witnessed the burning of a priest's daughter. This was accomplished by wrapping her in bundles of straw which were then set ablaze, (Sanh. 52b; Tos. Sanh. IX, 11). And the only explanation given by the later Tannaim and Amoraim is that it was שלא היה ב"ר של איזה שעה בקי, or that it was בית דין של צדוקין. A Sadducean practice it certainly was, and Josephus, or rather his source, records this older practice.

Let us now consider the law stated in § 24 concerning בן סורר ומורה, the rebellious son. Of course the Deuteronomic law, which has the penalty of stoning for the youth accused by his parents of disobedience as shown by his gluttony and inebriety, appears to be exceedingly harsh and inhuman. While the opinion of R. Jose in Sifre is that his death is to prevent his committing greater crimes מוטב שימות זכאי ואל ימות חייב, Rabbi Simeon declares the whole law to have remained a mere theory—לא היה אלא עתיד להיות אלא דרש יקבל—לא היה אלא עתיד להיות אלא דרש יקבל (B. Snh. 71a). On the other hand, the אנשי ירושלים in Sifre make the whole procedure on the part of the parents optional—אם רוצים אביו ואמו למחול מוחלין לו. As a matter of fact, then, the Halakik exposition of the whole Law imposes such conditions upon the whole case as to make it illusory. Still we have the testimony of R. Jonathan, pupil of R. Ismael, of the second century, that he sat upon the

grave of a rebellious son who had been executed, (Sanh. 71a). And what does this statement imply? Nothing less than that the grave of such a young culprit was marked and pointed out after generations as a warning. Ehrlich has here the fine remark that the law speaks of זקני עירו and אנשי עירו, not עירם to imply that the life of the young culprit was, or threatened to be, a scandal to his own city, and consequently his death was to be a warning to other young men. Now, it is just in this light that Josephus in a rather lengthy discourse deals with the case, putting words of monition into the mouths of the parents, in which ideas are expressed emphasizing that insolence towards parents causes the displeasure of God as the Father of mankind. (Compare the Yer. Sanh. VIII, 26, 6, ארם זה אפילו אביו שבשמים אינו שומע, (אם)). But there the law is given as follows: "Let him be brought by his parents out of the city with a multitude following him, and there let him be stoned. (Compare likewise Contra Apionem, II, 28). And when he has continued there for one whole day εἰς ἑμέραν, as a spectacle for all the people, he is to be buried at night." And thus it is, continues the paragraph, that we bury all whom the law condemns to die. Even enemies that fall in battle should be buried, and not one dead body should remain uninterred, or suffer a punishment beyond that which justice requires. We have here the law of מציצה בפה, and the prohibition of ניוול המת belonging rather to the Deuteronomic law קבור חקברנו ביום ההוא of the last two verses. And it is interesting to observe that the Talmud also derives the duty of burial, קבורה from the same Biblical verse, (Sanh. 46a).

Another penal law in Josephus may be mentioned in this connection. It is the 'forty-stripes-save-one' for him who acts contrary to the law (¶¶ 21-23). In the one case it is for an עובר במצות עשה, for not giving the poor their due, (or perhaps לא חקפץ את ידך), and the other for the מוציא שם רע. Now in regard to the forty-save-one, we are told in Makkot 22b that it is a Rabbinical decision: בס"ת כתיב ארבעים ואחת. רבנן ובצרו חרא. The fact is that the original reading, as may be learned from the LXX, was במספר ארבעים יכהו, the word במספר after רשעו כדי לפניו והכהו being certainly misplaced in the Massoretic text, and the meaning of במספר is 'about'

the number and not 'fully up to' the number forty. (Compare the same expression, 'forty stripes save one' which Paul is said to have received in the synagogue five times, II. Corinth. 21, 24).

The most striking difference between the traditional view and the statements in Josephus, or rather his source, is that, according to the Mishnah, there was the great Sanhedrin of 71 members in Jerusalem, in smaller cities of 120 inhabitants, the smaller Sanhedrin of 23 and a small body of three judges in still smaller towns, (Sanh. I, 6). Over against this we read in Josephus, (§ 16), Let there rule over every city seven men who have before manifested virtuous character and their zeal for justice, and to each magistrate or rulership there should be given two men out of the tribe of Levi as subordinates. These men who are chosen to judge in the several cities, continues the paragraph, are to be held in great honor and reverence like God, (אלהים), for 'right is the power of God,' Deut. I, 17. Should these judges, however, not know how to decide the matter, they shall bring the undetermined case to the holy city, and there let the high-priest, the prophet and the elders (or Sanhedrin) convene and decide it according to their opinion. At first sight the Mishnaic Halakah and the one presented by Josephus seem to be irreconcilable; and, of course, for the traditionalists, Josephus' statement must give way. But our collection of laws refers to the seven judges again in § 37 with reference to the oath of the שומר חנם, Ex. XXII, 7: ונקרב בעל הבית אל האלהים, the term being also taken by the Rabbis as referring to the Judges; and in Bell. Jud. II, 29, 5 we are told that Josephus appointed for the whole province of Galilee seventy elders as the Sanhedrin, and for each city seven judges, the greater cases and capital crimes to be brought before the court of seventy and him as president. This historical fact certainly speaks against the Mishnah. But there are a number of Talmudic passages which confirm the statement that each city had a magistracy of seven persons. These seven aldermen bore the name of ז' טובי העיר, (Meg. 26a), for which Yer. Meg. III, 1, 74a, has ז' מבני העיר and the Tos. Meg. III, 1, פרנסי העיר, and they are undoubtedly identical with the חבר העיר of Meg. 27b, Ber.

IV, 7, B. K. III, 12, Tos. Peah, IV, 16: חבר העיר לטובה; Shebi'it, VIII, 9. They were invested with civil, judicial and religious power. In Mishnaic times, however, it seems, the civil and judicial powers were no longer assigned to the same persons; and the only reminiscence of judges was preserved in regard to the seven judges that decided the קידוש החדש (Sanh. I, 2). Geiger (Urschrift, p. 117) jeopardized his position in accepting Josephus' authority against the Mishnah by identifying the seven aldermen of the city with the ז' אמרכלים (Shek. V, 2), who were only temple officers. According to Acts 6, 3 the early Church also had seven men charged with the administration of the common property and the charity. The number seven, which in ancient Babylonia signified completeness, determined the heavenly and earthly mode of organization throughout. Persia, whose seven heavenly powers and the seven chiefs at the royal court, רואי פני המלך, gave rise also to the seven arch-angels in the Jewish cosmology, was influenced by it; and hence arose also the Jewish city magistrates, seven in number. The number three, however, was selected as we see from Megillah, (loc. cit.), as the representatives of each בית הכנסת, or each synagogue, and thus may have been deemed sufficient in later Mishnaic times for the decision of ordinary cases. As Schuerer correctly remarks, the Mishnah never calls these three men by the name Bet Din. Of especial significance, and actually corroborating the record in Josephus regarding the seven judges or aldermen, is the statement that they had two Levites as subordinates. This, as has been pointed out by Weyl and previously by David Hoffman, is in full accord with the Halakik interpretation, (Sifre 68b) of the word שוטרים in the verse: שופטים ושוטרים תתן לך בכל שעריך, namely, שופטים אלו הלוויים המכים ברצועה שנאמר ושוטרים הלוויים לפניכם, (II Chron. XIX, 11); and so in Yebamot 86b: א"ר חסדא בתחלה לא היו מעמידים שוטרים אלא מן הלוויים שנאמר . . . עכשו אין מעמידים שוטרים אלא מן ישראל. These were later called the two חזנים in Sanh. 17b. At any rate the Deuteronomic law demanded judges and inferior officers, שופטים ושוטרים, for each city; yet the Mishnaic Halakah fails to provide for these; the one in Josephus does. (It is needless to say that

in identifying these Levites who were only sheriffs with the Bet Din of the Levites, Geiger made another mistake fatal to his theory.)

Of the Small Sanhedrin, the court of twenty-three judges which the Mishnah assigns to larger cities Josephus makes no mention; and it seems that this was only a later institution,—except in the Temple where the three smaller Sanhedrin (סנהדרין קטנה) formed together the Bet Din Hagadol,—since Josephus as governor of Galilee appointed seventy judges for a Sanhedrin with himself as president.

For the great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem our paragraph has the remarkable statement that besides the Senate or Elders there were the high priest and the *prophet* to decide the important cases. Now, this is altogether in contradiction to the Mishnaic or Pharisaic view which ignores the Synhedrial presidency of the high-priests after Simeon the Just II, and assigns to the first of the Zuggot and then to the head of the Academy, Hillel and his descendants and to Johanan ben Zakkai, the title Nasi, a view which is irreconcilable with the historic facts presented in Josephus and the Gospels; also with the Jewish coins that speak of the *חבר היהודים* as the Senate and the High Priest. The historian cannot but regard the Mishnah in Abot as an artificial product of the schools, made for the purpose of creating a chain of tradition. The one point still unexplained in our statement, however, are the words 'and the prophet' alongside of the high-priest. To assume with David Hoffman in his 'Gerichtshof' that the high-priest was also the prophet as wearing the Urim we-Tumim is preposterous. However, the Deuteronomic law, XVIII, 8-13, which refers to the High Court in Jerusalem, mentions as those constituting the same, *ובאת אל הכהנים הלויים ואל השופט אשר יהיה בימים ההם*, and afterwards *הכהן העומד לשרת שם או אל השופט* that is to say, the high priest *and* the judge. The latter term *Shofet* is explained by Driver in his Commentary to the passage, XIX, 17, as the 'foreman of the lay judges,' whereas 'the priest' *הכהן* refers to the president of the priestly judges. So indeed, according to II Chron. XIX, 8-11, King Josiah instituted a court with a double presidency, the high priest and the secular prince, *הנגיד לבית יהודה*. Obviously when the

Book of Chronicles was written, there existed such a high court with the high priest as the political head and a מופלא בית דין, 'one distinguished as a sage competent to decide difficult cases of the law,' (Sanh. 87a; Hor. 4b), who received the name of אב בית דין, the Patriarch of the Court; and it is he who is called in our document Prophet, that is Speaker or inspired sage of the court.

Here you have the real origin of the Zuggot, the Duum-viri, the meaning of which was afterwards no longer fully understood. In my opinion this paragraph alone gives evidence that Josephus did only embody, and not write, the collection of laws before us.

Very strange, however, and contrary to the whole attitude of the Halakah towards heathenism is the tenth paragraph which refers the Scriptural verse, Ex. XXII, 27, אלהים לא תקלל to heathen gods: "Let no one blaspheme gods which other cities regard as such, or steal what belongs to a strange temple, nor take away any treasure dedicated to any god." The older Tannaim differ as to whether Elohim here is to be חול, a profane term referring to the Judges (so R. Ishmael) or whether it is קדש, a holy term referring to the Deity—so R. Akiba, (Sanh. 66a—and Mekilta has the names of the Tannaim inverted). Now, it is quite significant that the LXX which translates the word Elohim in והגישו אדוניו אל האלהים, (Ex. XXI, 6), 'to the Tribunal of God,' meaning Judges, has here: Thou shalt not vilify gods, obviously referring the word Elohim to the heathen gods. This is especially accentuated by Philo in De Legibus I, 53, with the explanation that the heathen, on hearing his deity vilified, will in his anger also vilify the true God. So also in Vita Mosis, II, 20, 4-5, where the verse, Lev. XXIV, 15f., is translated, Elohov is also referred to by him, as the heathen gods. Also in his work Contra Apionem, II, 33, Josephus says: "Our legislator has expressly forbidden us to laugh at and blaspheme those that are esteemed by other people, because the name of God is ascribed to them." Exactly the same reason is given by Philo in the Life of Moses, II, 166. Now the generally accepted view is that Josephus wrote this, following Philo, simply from an apologetic motive, in order to shield the Jews against the charge

of hostility to the heathen world. But this leaves the attitude of the LXX unexplained. It seems to me that the proselytizing tendencies prevailing in the times of Hillel and Philo and previously in the times of John Hyrcanus and referred to in Math. 23, 15, (Ye compass sea and land and make one proselyte), and the corresponding passage in Bereshit R. XXVIII, 5, and Shir-ha-Shirim R., to I, 4, have given rise to the interpretation of Elohim. The rules concerning the גר חושב rest, strange to say, in the Deuteronomic law: לֹא תִסְגִּיר עִבֵּד אֶל אֲדֹנָיו, XXIII, 16, which is explained: Do not turn him away who has fled from his heavenly masters, the heathen gods, but support him and vex him not . . . by saying to him, You once served idols. (See Targ. Yer., Sifre and Gittin 45a.) From Philo we learn, as is shown in my article on Asenath in J. E., that they had hospices instituted for the protection and training of proselytes, and it is in this connection that the term Elohim was given a larger meaning in order that the Ger may not be חוזר לסורו, return to his idolatrous practices.

Accordingly neither Josephus nor Philo invented the law to insinuate themselves into the hearts of the non-Jews, but the general attitude of the older generation was favorable to what we would call today a Church Universal based upon Piety and Reverence.

We now come to speak of those laws of humanity, the מצות בני נח treated by Philo in his Hypothetica and called by him the laws of Buzyges (the Athenian Noah), concerning which Bernays (Ges. Abh. 1, 262) wrote a most interesting article. This Athenian Noah, Buzyges, cursed, we are told, any one who would mislead one who asks for advice by intentionally giving him the wrong advice. Now these laws Philo first comprises in general in the Golden Rule: That which is hateful to thee do not unto thy fellow; and then he continues: A man shall not take up what he has not put down—in other words, he should not appropriate things that are not absolutely his. This is השבת אברה. Then follows: No one shall refuse fire to him who asks for it, nor shall he cut off the stream of water. Next comes the law of מצות מות, not to leave any corpse found anywhere lying in a field or street unburied.

Another law given there is the prohibition of castration of a man, or abortions. Then come all the laws regarding *צער בעלי חיים*, any inhumanity towards animals; one of which is not to refuse protection to the animal that flees to you for refuge, reminding us of what is told to R. Judah Hanassi. Now let us see what Josephus has, In his work *Contra Apionem*, II, 29, he has the laws to afford fire, water, and food to any man who wants them, to show him the road and to let no one lie unburied. Here we cannot but assume that he followed Philo. Quite different it is with our collection where these laws are given in a different order and, in fact, as derived from the Mosaic Law. The law of burying the dead 'wherever found,' which received at an early time the characteristic term *מת מצוה* and which plays so prominent a role in the Book of Tobit of the second pre-Christian century is connected in ¶ 24 with the Deuteronomic verse, *כי קבר תקברנו ביום ההוא* (XXI, 23), whence the Talmud derives the law of burial, (*קבורה מן התורה*: 46b: *מניין*). The duty to show strangers the road and not to mislead others is derived in ¶ 31 exactly as in Targ. Yer. from Deut. XXVII, 18, *ארור משגה עור בדרך*, and as the Talmud has from *מכשל לא חתן מכשל*. (Lev. XIX, 14.) Especially interesting is that for *השבח אברה* in Ex. XXII, 8, ¶ 29 says that, whosoever finds gold or silver on the road should make inquiries and have proclamation made of the place where he found it. (Comp. B. M. II, 1-6, and Gemara.) This very same law has also been found in that remarkable document of the Damascus sect of Sadduceans discovered by Schechter, according to which no one can take a thing lost unless he had a proclamation made in the open field and then the other must swear an oath that it is his. Now, I have shown that this corresponds exactly with the *אבן הטוען*, the Stone of the Litigant mentioned as existing in the time of Simon ben Shetaḥ in 100 B. C. (Y. Ta'an. 66d; Ta'anit III, 11; B. M. 28b). Yet it is quite interesting to notice that the LXX translates Ex. XXII, 8 *על כל אברה אשר* with 'any kind of destruction (loss) that is charged'; showing that it must have read the Niphal *יאמר*. At any rate we have an old law recorded in Josephus.

Again, there is the law in ¶ 34: Let no one of the Israelites

keep any poison that may cause death or any other harm; and if he be caught with it, let him be put to death and suffer the evil he had contemplated bringing upon him for whom the poison was prepared. Ritter thinks that it was taken over by Josephus from Philo, (II, 315-17), who, with reference to Ex. XXII, 17 and Lev. XVIII, 10, declares that those who prepare poison are subject to the penalty of death. Thus also the Pseudo-Phokylidean law 149: Prepare not poisonous doings. Our law goes still further and says: Let no one of the Israelites keep poison. Weyl, 67, refers to the parallel in the Roman law, but I regard it as part of the older collection of laws, derived, as was suggested by Ritter, from the law in Deut. XXII, 8, which R. Nathan extends to the avoidance of anything which may imperil human life. (B. K. 15b.)

A similar law is (§ 40) the prohibition of castration. He who castrates himself is like killing his children, and it is unlawful to castrate men or animals. This is, as the Talmud has it in Shab. 110b, derived from Lev. XXII, 24 **ובאצרכם** **לא תעשו** and, according to R. Chidkai, also forbidden to the **בן נח**, Sanh. 56b. Says R. Eliezer: He who does not marry, is 'as if he had spilled blood.' (Yeb. 63b.)

The same is the case with the non-Halakik prohibition of abortion which may have been derived from Ex. XXI, 22.

In order, however, to confine the subject within the limits of this article it will be necessary for me to classify the laws given in Josephus and to point out only their general character. There are those of a more or less Sadducean nature: There is the *Jus Talionis* for which our law says, (§ 35): "He that maimeth one, let him undergo the like himself, and let him be deprived of the same member of which he has deprived the other." Then it adds: "Unless he who is maimed will accept money for injury," for the law gives to the injured the right of stating the value of that from which he has suffered, and he may be satisfied therewith, if he does not desire to be more severe in the exaction. Here we have a middle stage between the Sadducean and the Pharisaic Halakah. Philo, (II, 332), expressly states the law: An eye for an eye. And it is of importance to note that R. Eliezer, the Shammaite, says in

B. K. 84a, עין אחת עין ממש. In B. K. 83b the Talmud derived it from the statement in Num. XXXV, 31, לא תקחו כפר לנפש רצח אשר הוא רשע למוח that only for life no ransom be taken, but for single limbs or organs compensation be claimed in the shape of money.

Likewise in regard to the collusive witnesses, our law reads that a false witness must suffer the same punishment he had intended to bring upon others, based literally upon Deut. XIX, 16f. This, however, is against the Pharisaic Halakah of Mak. 5b, הרנו אין נהרגין לא הרנו נהרגין. Geiger, in the *Urschrift*, 140 and 195, has called attention to the remarkable difference between Simon ben Shetaḥ and Jehudah ben Tabbaï which finds its echo in the Susanna story, and he is certainly right in assuming that the Pharisaic standpoint is a later development. Our Josephus records confirm this, as Josephus accentuates the Halakik rule that the witnesses must have been accepted by the court, ער שנמדר הדין. In regard to the late Pharisaic interpretation of ופרשו את השמלה we find the Josephus law in ¶ 23 not clear, for according to the same, the husband must bring proofs for his charge that she was not a virgin; but it is very probable that he took the expression figuratively as did R. Eliezer b. Jacob in Yer. Ket., 28a, and R. Ishmael in Sifre, חברים המחזורין כשמלה. In regard to the Ḥalizah rite Josephus, ¶ 23, has the old Halakah: "She shall spit in his face," וירקה בפניו, against the Mishnah and in favor of the literal interpretation.

In regard to divorce, Josephus presents in ¶ 23 the view of Hillel. He says: "He who desires to be divorced from his wife, for any cause whatsoever, and many such causes—adds Josephus—happen among men." Philo, (II, 304; 313), also has: "If he has some sort of a reason." While this does not exactly agree with R. Akiba's view that he may divorce her 'if he has found another woman superior in beauty to her,' it differs essentially from the Shammaite view, which takes the Deuteronomic term ערוה דבר as identical with דבר ערוה and signifying some kind of lewdness, (cf. Matth. 5, 32), and is in accord with the Hillelites, who take the term ערוה דבר here in the same sense as it occurs in Deut. XXIII, 15, where it simply means 'impropriety' (*Gittin*

IX, 10). Thus the word is also explained by modern exegetes.

The rule, (§ 15), that women, 'on account of the levity of their sex' cannot testify is, of course, based upon old traditional practice, for which the Talmud, (Shab. 30a), finds a superficial support in Deut. XIX, 17: "The two men shall stand up as witness," but not women. More to the point is Weyl, (l. c.) and his reference to the Midrash Yelamdenu to Gen. XVIII, 15: "Then Sarah denied saying, 'I laughed not.' From this may be derived the rule that women are not considered to be trustworthy witnesses."

The peculiar interpretation, of מִחִיר כֶּלֶב, (Deut. XXIII, 19), 'the price of a dog used for pairing,' suggested by the אֶתְנָן וְנָה, presents a transitory stage in the Rabbinic Halakah, (Sifre and Temurah 30a), the original meaning of 'dog,' (c. f. Commentaries), having been forgotten later on. The rather strange rule in § 16 that rewards be proposed to any one who will discover the murderer of the body found slain seems to rest upon an older practice.

To a priestly origin of the collection of laws points the additional remark in § 11 regarding the prohibition of garments made of wool and linen, (Deut. XXII, 11), for that is appointed to be for the priests alone, (cf. Yer. Kilayim IX, 31d and 32a). Mention is made in § 13 of the Tephillin as being 'worn on the arm and the forehead to be a reminder everywhere of God's power and good-will to Israel' and also of the Mezzuzah, but not of the Zizit, 'the fringes on the four corners of the garment' prescribed in the Deuteronomic verses following closely upon the prohibition of She'atnez, which gave rise to the Tallit worn constantly by the Pharisees. On the other hand, the recital of the Shema twice a day is prescribed in § 13 in the form of a commemoration of Israel's deliverance from the land of Egypt, obviously with reference to Deut. XVI, 3, (cf. Sifre).

Quite remarkable is the interpretation of the law, Deut. XXIV, 16: "The fathers shall not be put to death for their children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers" which the Pharisaic Halakah takes to mean: Neither shall be put to death upon the testimony of the

other, that is, near relatives should not be taken up as witnesses, (see Sifre). Josephus, (§ 39), has: "You are not to punish children for the faults of their parents nor ought we to impute the sins of children to their fathers." This certainly contradicts the view of the rabbis that, 'children when not having reached the age of manhood, ש"ס, may meet death at the hand of Heaven on account of the sins of their parents'; (Sifre; cf. Shab. 32b), and it is difficult to say whether the paragraph emanated from Josephus' hand or from his source. It has more the characteristics of the style of Josephus.

THE SABBATH AND FESTIVALS IN PRE-EXILIC AND EXILIC TIMES

IN ORDER to trace the origin of the Sabbath and the festivals and follow up the stages of their development, we must not consult the codes of law and the meaning attached to the words of the same in later times, but examine certain historical facts in other narratives and in occasional allusions and draw our conclusions therefrom. By this method of historical-critical research we arrive at an altogether different calendar system in ancient Israel than that with which we are familiar. The Sabbath and the festivals have gone through a process of evolution which we must try to unravel and which few of our historians have made clear. Nor have our Assyriologists succeeded in elucidating this process, especially in regard to the Sabbath, as the recent work of Morris Jastrow, *Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions*, and an article of his on 'The Day after the Sabbath' (AJSL 30, 94ff.) seem to show.

THE SABBATH

To begin with the Sabbath, let me state that we know as yet too little of the Assyrian Sabbath to build important theories concerning the origin of the Jewish Sabbath upon it. The name *Shabbatum* in the Babylonian calendar has been found by Pinches in a glossary to designate the full moon; hence the Hebrew Sabbath must have had the same meaning, according to Jastrow, Meinhart, and others. On the other hand there was brought to light long ago a Babylonian Elul calendar according to which the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th days were regarded as unlucky days, on which the priest-king was not allowed to officiate as judge, use fire, eat cooked meat, etc.; but the term Sabbath is not applied to these *dies nefasti*. Now, while the older Assyriologists were inclined to identify these days of the Elul calendar with the Hebrew Sabbath (suggesting that the

nineteenth day was really the forty-ninth—that is, seven times seven, counted from the beginning of the previous month), modern Assyriologists no longer lay stress upon this fact, and insist instead upon the other fact that Shabbatum designates exclusively the full moon. Combining with it the etymology of Shabat, which is elsewhere explained by *gamar* 'to complete,' they explain the term Shabbatum to be the time of the completion of the moon's light, 'when the sun on the other side of the sky casts its full light upon it.' Prof. Jastrow goes even so far as to explain the *ממחרת השבת* to have meant originally the morrow of the full moon, because the Passover feast begins on the 15th of Nisan, assuming the verse in question to belong to two or three different sources. As we shall later see, the whole argument regarding the Passover feast rests on a fundamental error. But aside from that, I do not think that there is any basis or justification whatsoever for identifying the Hebrew Sabbath at any time with the full moon. It seems to me that we are not in a position as yet to assume with any kind of certainty that the Hebrew Sabbath was simply taken over from the Babylonians, at least in historical times. Like all the things Babylonians and Hebrews had in common, the Sabbath seems to me to belong to an older epoch when the Babylonian lore was not as yet developed, and the Hebrew Sabbath may just as well throw light on the Babylonian Shabbatum as *vice versa*. Each had its own process of growth.

This much, however, is certain, that the Hebrew Sabbath is not only older than the Decalogue of the Exodus, which connects it with the Creation week, as does the Elohist in the first chapter of Genesis, but also older than the original form of the Decalogue: *זכור את יום השבת לקדשו*, which refers to the Sabbath as an established and known institution, and is by no means a new commandment. It is, however, quite noteworthy that the older Decalogue of Ex. XXXIV simply says, *שש ימים תעבוד וביום השביעי תשבת*, while the same Sabbath is implied but not mentioned. The chapter on the Manna, Ex. XVI, offers indubitably an explanation for the Decalogue expression *זכור את יום השבת* by the narrative's placing the commandment of the Sabbath before the Sinai

Revelation—a point of view which the rabbis present in connection with the words *שם שם לו חק ומשפט* in Ex. XV, 25 (see Mekilta, ad loc.).

For us, however, the question is whether the Hebrew Sabbath was from the beginning based upon the fixed institution of the week, which certainly rests on Babylonian astrology, or whether it originally corresponded with the four lunar phases, so that the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first and twenty-eighth of each month were the days of the moon's 'stand-still,' that is, Sabbath days. The latter view is expressed by Nowack, *Hebr. Arch.* 2, 144, who refers also to Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*², p. 107. It seems to me that too little stress has been laid on the important fact that, throughout the entire pre-exilic literature, the Sabbath occupies only the second place alongside of the new moon, which is always mentioned first and foremost as a day of rest and of feasting, of sacrifice and of seeking the word or oracle of the Deity as given through the sacred seer. I refer to the well-known passages, II Ki. IV, 23; Am. VIII, 5; Hos. II, 13; Is. I, 13; LXVI, 23, where *חדש* always precedes the Sabbath. Down to the Exile—Ezekiel forms the interesting turning-point, as we shall see later on—the New Moon played a far greater role in ancient Israel than may be inferred from the Mosaic Code, where it is no longer made a day of rest, but has only the character of a survival in the Temple Cult. Note, however, Amos VIII, 5, where the people are represented as saying: *מתי יעבר החדש נשבירה*: i. e., they could not sell corn on the New Moon, just as they could not on the Sabbath. Very characteristically we find the day previous to the New Moon, and in distinction from the same, called by Jonathan (I Sam. XX, 19) *יום המעשה* 'Work Day,' which plainly shows the New Moon to have been celebrated by the people as a holy day. The presumption, then, is that the New Moon was the more solemn holy day, given over to feasting and sacrifices of a higher order among the families, such as we find it celebrated in the royal house of Saul and occasionally among certain classes in Israel (*זבח הימים שם לכל*) *המשפחה*, I Sam. XX, 6), over against which the Sabbath days of the month were but, so to say, diminutive moon

seasons, four holy days of lesser solemnity and importance. But this very chapter reveals a fact the importance of which has not been recognized by historians. It is the agreement of David and Jonathan to meet again in the field on the third day, that is on the day following the two New Moon days (XX, 5, 12, 19). That they could thus speak beforehand of the two New Moon days as a self-evident matter shows that the New Moon was not celebrated only on the first day of the month, when the reappearance of the moon had been observed by the respective functionaries, but on two days; that is, on the twenty-ninth and thirtieth days of the month, the latter day leading over to the next month, which was counted from the day following as the first day of the first lunar week. We get in this way the following division of the month: four lunar weeks, each ending with the Sabbath, and these twenty-eight days to be followed by the two New Moon days—thirty days altogether. But they occasionally divided the month into decades, as did the Egyptians, and as we learn from the term עשור לעשר and עשור לחודש. As a rule, however, the heptad prevailed. The holy number seven belongs to very ancient Semitic traditions, as all the oaths are made among the various Semitic tribes by the number seven. Hence we have the word נשבע 'to swear,' which means 'to be bound by the holy seven.' (Whether the seven planets or Pleiades or some other seven was the object is not as yet ascertained.) The name שבועה for week, also שבוע, (in Jacob's story: וזאת מלא נא שבוע זמנך Gen. XXIX, 27) is certainly old. All the festivities in private and public life filled up a full week, and, strange to say, the Sabbath is never mentioned in this connection. Not even in the story of the siege of Jericho is there any mention of the Sabbath. This can be accounted for only by the assumption that the Sabbath as a separate institution is of a later date.

The new and full moon, however, were celebrated by all Semitic, nay by all primitive, tribes. The Moon was the real Measurer of time, as the Greek or Aryan *μῆν* expresses it. Especially for the wandering tribes of the desert the Moon is the guide on the night march. Consequently the Bedouin still hails the appearance of the new moon with shouting,

dancing, and clapping of hands, as Doughty describes it in his *Arabia Deserta*. And we learn from Job XXXI, 27 that the idolatrous practice of throwing kisses at the moon was still practised when that book was written. How much of a recrudescence of this was allowed to come in by the cabbalistic writers in the solemn greetings of the Kiddush-Lebanah rite, is not necessary to point out here. At any rate the New Moon celebrations, which were undoubtedly connected with the Canaanite or Semitic worship of the queen of Heaven, and the round cakes, כֻּנִּים, offered her on the rooftops of the houses, as we learn from Jer. XLIV, 17-25, could not but meet with disfavor on the part of the Hebrew legislators. Here we have the reason for the abrogation of the New Moon as a day of rest. Only the priestly tradition retained the New Moon in the cult (Ezek. XLV, 17; XLVI; and Num. XXVIII, 10f.). The Cabbalists, or Mystics, during the late Middle Ages gave dignity to the New Moon, and by a strange atavism, the Jewish women—compare the women in Egypt mentioned by Jeremiah—desisted on that day from doing work. The priest-prophet Ezekiel in his legislative system accords to the New Moon only the second place alongside of the Sabbath (cf. Ezek. XLVI, 1-3). A still more interesting change which the New Moon has undergone in the writing of Ezekiel, and which henceforth influenced the literature of the Jewish people (Num. XXVIII, 10 and elsewhere) is that the name is changed from חֹדֶשׁ 'renewal' into רֵאשׁ חֹדֶשׁ 'beginning of the month,' and חֹדֶשׁ henceforth stands for month. We shall soon see what this implied for the regulation of the festivals in the Mosaic Code. But we have to turn our attention first to the new concept of the Sabbath.

The Sabbath is transformed in the Decalogue from a lunar holy day into a day of the Lord, and made an institution independent of the phases of the moon, a weekly institution, whether for the rest of man, as the Deuteronomic decalogue has it, or as a testimony to God's creation of the world in a seven-day week, as the decalogue in Exodus has it. The latter idea is, of course, a transformation of the Babylonian myth in the monotheistic spirit. With Ezekiel (XX, 20) begins the special accentuation of the

Sabbath as a sign between Israel and his God, and hence also the Holiness Code, which emanated from the Ezekiel school, renders it a special sign of the covenant between Israel and the Lord (Ex. XXXI, 13, 17). In the Priest Code the ancient concepts of the Sabbath as a day of austerity and of the prohibition of labor, of the use of fire, of cooking, etc., made themselves felt again, and this led to ever greater rigidity in the Sadducean and Karaite and then in the Shammaite circles, whereas the Exilic seer in Is. LVIII, 13 voices a different view regarding the joy and cheer on Sabbath, though wishing to have the day devoted to divine things exclusively. The passage in Jeremiah (XVII, 19-27) threatening those that trade on the Sabbath with the conflagration of the city belongs to the time of Nehemiah and ought never to have been assigned to the great prophet.

Before concluding my views on the Sabbath, I wish to call attention to the one fact which the Assyriologists have failed to consider. Had the Sabbath been really known in Babylonia as a holy day outside of the priestly cult, the Biblical Sabbath could never have been made the sign of the covenant, or a mark distinguishing the Jewish people from the rest, as is already done by Deutero-Isaiah and by Ezekiel. The idea of the distinction of Israel from the surrounding nations became the guiding motive in the Mosaic Code also for the festivals, as we shall now see.

PESAH

There can hardly be any dispute as to the meaning of חַדֵּשׁ 'New Moon,' wherever it occurs in ancient literature. Let me ask, then, when is Passover to take place, according to Deuteronomy? There can be but one translation of XVI, 1, חַדֵּשׁ חֹדֶשׁ הָאֲבִיב וְעָשִׂיתָ פֶּסַח לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ כִּי בַחֹדֶשׁ הָאֲבִיב, 'Observe the New Moon of the Ripening Crops and offer the Paschal sacrifice, for on the New Moon of the Ripening Crops hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt at night.' To translate חַדֵּשׁ by 'month' is simply impossible in view of the word לַיְלָה at the end of the verse. In other words, the Passover at the time of

King Josiah was celebrated, not on the eve of the 15th, but on the eve of the New Moon. Nor was it, as described in Exodus XII, the sacrificial day of a lamb, but, as we read in the following verse, of all kinds of animals taken from the flock and the cattle. This Deuteronomic precept receives its light from Ex. XIII, 1-10, 11-16, where we have the duplicate of the law prescribing consecration of the first-born of man and beast and the sacrifice of the first-born of the beast on the memorial day of the Exodus. There we read also: הַיּוֹם אַתֶּם יּוֹצֵאִים בְּחֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב 'This day have you been going out of Egypt on the New Moon of the Ripening Crops.' So also in Ex. XXXIV, 18 and XXIII, 15 (where the same law is given concerning the Feast of Mazzot with especial reference to the redemption, or sacrifice of the first-born). There we find also the express statement: כֹּאשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיךָ לְמוֹעֵד חֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב כִּי בְּחֹדֶשׁ הָאָבִיב יֵצֵאת מִמִּצְרַיִם 'On the New Moon of the ripening of the Crops didst thou go out of Egypt.' By the way, let me say here that that little fragment in Ex. IV, 22-26, הִנֵּה אֲנִי הֹרֵג אֶת בֶּן בְּכֹרְךָ בְּכֹרֶךָ ending with בְּכֹרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל belongs to the oldest stratum of the Exodus story in connection with the Pesah, connecting the Shepherd Spring feast with the death of the first-born. Originally then the Pesah as a festival of Spring was celebrated on the New Moon of the Spring Month, when the blood of the first-born of the flock or cattle was put on the forehead and hand of the people, and also sprinkled on the door-post and door-sill, a practice that is still in vogue among fellahin natives of Palestine, Syria, and the Arabian peninsula (see Curtiss, *Ursemitische Religion*, p. 206ff. and Dillmann, *ad loc.*). The change from the New Moon to the Full Moon is first recorded by the prophet Ezekiel, XLV, 21, and then in the priest code, Ex. XII and Lev. XXIII, which latter chapter is of composite nature and not a pure product of the Holiness Code. As a matter of fact the Passover feast was only, in consequence of the Deuteronomic Code, transformed from a Shepherd household feast into a national festival under King Josiah (II Ki. XXIII, 22), and then connected with the Mazzot feast.

THE FEAST OF WEEKS

Coming to the Feast of Weeks, we observe that it nowhere has a special date as to the month, or day, like the other festivals. It was and remained even during the period of the second temple an agricultural festival, the time of which was determined by the end of the harvest of the barley and wheat crops, which lasted seven weeks. The Deuteronomic Law simply says: "Thou shalt count seven weeks"—that is seven times seven days, without a mention of the Sabbath anywhere—"and then thou shalt celebrate the Feast of Weeks." The older code of the Covenant calls it חג הקציר adding בכורי מעשיר (קציר). Ezekiel does not mention it at all; for שבועות in XLV, 21 is a scribal error. But the law in Lev. XXIII, 9ff. devotes to it a long paragraph, which has become a matter of dispute not only among priest and sage, Sadducee and Pharisee of olden times, but also among the scholars, Jewish and non-Jewish, to this very day. I refer to the well-known passage in verses 15-17. I hold that no unbiased reader can translate this otherwise than the Sadducees originally did: 'Ye shall count from the day following the Sabbath, on which day you bring the Omer of the first barley harvest [of which it expressly says, v. 11, מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת יִנִּיפּוּ הַכֹּהֵן], seven weeks, and then on the following day, the morrow of the seventh Sabbath, which is the fiftieth day (Pentecost), ye shall celebrate the Feast of Weeks.' In other words, then, on the day following the Sabbath when they swung the sickle at the standing corn (which, of course, could not be done on the Sabbath Day), they offered the Omer of the first barley, and on the day following the seventh Sabbath, which is the fiftieth day, they brought the two loaves of bread made from the new wheat as a sacrifice for the Feast of Weeks. What has been lacking in this Biblical Law is a specific date, which was not necessary, as it depended each year on the time of the ripening of the crops. This was good enough for the priests of the Temple, but what about the Jew living far away from the holy land? Should he forego celebrating the Feast of Weeks? It is remarkable that the Book of Jubilees (6, 17f.; 14, 20-21) takes the name חג

השבועות to be the feast of the covenant oaths, telling us that the covenant made with Noah, with Abraham, and with Israel on Sinai were all made on the fifteenth of Sivan.

The rabbis, with reference to Ex. XIX, 1, point to the giving of the decalogue as the historical event which took place on the sixth, or as R. Jose says in Shabbat 86b, the seventh, of Sivan, the יום מתן תורה-הג הקציר יום שבו נתנה תורה ל ישראל (Shemot R. XXXI, 17), taking the term Kāzīr as the spiritual harvest, the day when the Law was given to Israel. Of course, the חדש השלישי here also can refer only to the first day, since it says ביום הזה. But the rabbis, or rather the Pharisees, wanted to have a close connection made between Pesah and Shabuot in order to fix the date of the latter, and at the same time give it a historical character, and so they interpreted the words ממחרת השבת to mean 'on the day following the first day of Pesah.' So already the LXX has it. The first step to this connection between Pesah and the Omer sacrifice was taken at the time when the story of Israel's entrance into Canaan was told by the people, about which the Book of Joshua tells us that ממחרת הפסח, on the morrow of the Pesah, that is on the fifteenth day of Nisan, the people ate Mazzot of the produce of the land, while the Manna ceased. This ממחרת הפסח in Joshua could serve as some kind of support to the Pharisees to refer the expression ממחרת השבת of the Omer to the day after the first day of Pesah, while the Karaites and their predecessors, the Boethusians, and the Falashas refer it to the day after the last day of Pesah, so as to bring the Shabuot festival close to the fifteenth of Sivan (see Jubilees, l. c.).

THE SUKKOT FEAST

As to the Sukkot festival I have long ago come to the conviction, and I now find also Dr. Ehrlich's commentary and Carpenter, quoted by Berthelot, Leviticus, p. 79, on my side, that the name has nothing to do with the harvest tents, as most modern exegetes think. There is nowhere such an allusion to harvest tents in the Bible, neither in Deuteronomy, where we might expect it, nor in Exodus

XXIII, 16 or XXXIV, 22, where it is simply called חֲנוּכָּה or חֲנֻכָּה. As a matter of fact, it was the Ḥag, 'Pilgrimage Feast' par excellence (see I Ki. XIII, 2; XII, 32; Lev. XXIII, 39-41; Ezek. XLV, 23; Neh. VIII, 14, and Mishna R. H. I, 2; cf. Nowack, l. c. 150). But it is an error to ascribe to the Sukkot feast, as Nowack does on p. 155, the Deuteronomic law concerning the offering of the first fruits (Deut. XVI, 1), as both the Mishnah Bikkurim III, 2 and Philo (Mangey, 2.298), who calls it 'the feast of the basket,' show that there was no connection between the two. Naturally the pilgrimage feast of the people took place after the summer's work was over, when they could come in large numbers to the temple of Shilo, or Jerusalem, as the Mohammedans come to Mecca for their Ḥajj. And where would they find a shelter, unless, as is done in Mecca, they would erect tents for all the strangers? This gave the pilgrimage feast the specific name of Feast of Tents. But the priestly legislator was not satisfied with this idea of a simple harvest festival. He was anxious to invest it with historical meaning, and so he connected it also with the story of the Exodus. But how? The usual interpretation is that the words 'I placed you in tents when I brought you out of Egypt' refer to the fact that the people, on their journey from Egypt in the Wilderness, dwelt in tents. But in this case the verse ought to read, בְּהוֹלִיכִי אוֹתָם בַּמִּדְבָּר, not בְּהוֹצִיאִי אוֹתָם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם. A glance at the history of the Exodus and the list of journeys shows that Sukkot was the gathering-place of the Hebrews, or the first station of their wanderings (Ex. XII, 37; XIII, 20; Num. XXXIII, 5). It matters not whether the name is derived from the tents built there, or whether the name happened to be Sukkot, just as we learn of Jacob that he gave the name Sukkot to a place where he built his tents (Gen. XXXIII, 17). The idea is that God provided a place of tents as a gathering-point for the fugitive slaves at their exodus from Egypt. Hence also the controversy between R. Eliezer, R. Akiba, and other Tannaim as to the meaning of Sukkot, whether it denotes the place of Israel's starting-point at the Exodus, or whether God built for them these tents, or whether He wrapped them in clouds like tents to protect them when

He brought them out of Egypt (see Mekilta to Ex. XII, 37; XIII, 20; Sifra to Lev. XXIII, 43). That the tents in which the wine harvest is celebrated by the people should have given rise to the festival, as is the opinion of the various exegetes (see Dillmann, Berthelot and Driver on Deut. XVI, 13, following Robinson, *Bibl. Researches*, 2.81f.) has no foundation in the Scripture, as there is nowhere any allusion made to the Sukkot feasts being celebrated as a wine festival, whereas the pilgrimage tents correspond to the name *Hag*.

As regards the striking difference which exists between Nehemiah VIII, 15, where the law regarding the Sukkot tents is quoted, and the passage in Lev. XXIII, 40, I am quite sure that our Code text has undergone a transformation, and that the text in Nehemiah is more authentic. According to the latter the plants mentioned were all used for the cover of the tents and instead of פרי the reading was פרי עץ הדר (not הדס 'myrtle', as Ehrlich thinks, nor can I accept his פארי 'branches,' instead of פרי). The Talmudic authorities have no longer any comprehension of פרי עץ הדר and do all sorts of guessing. Our Etrog is really the Persian Othrang, which is our orange; while Josephus (*Ant.* III, 10, 4) and LXX seem to think of a peach instead of a citron. The prophet Zechariah, or rather the author of the fourteenth chapter, which belongs to a very late date, gives us an insight into an altogether different and yet archaic character of the harvest feast of Sukkot, when he describes it as a feast of rain which is to bring its fertility to those nations who come to Jerusalem for the celebration of the feast, and the blessing of which is to be withheld from the nations who do not come to bow down before the One and Only God of Israel in Jerusalem. Obviously we have here an ancient water festival, traces of which are found also in Is. XII, 3 and XXX, 29. It is called in the Mishnah Sukkah (V, 1) *Simyat bet ha-sheobah*, 'Festivity of the House of the Water-drawing.' It consisted of a procession from the Shiloah Spring to the temple made by large crowds following the priest with his chalice of water for the water libation at the altar, and was preceded by dances during the whole night of each day of the Sukkot festival, amidst

the play of instruments and the carrying of torches, in which especially 'the Ḥasidim and the Wonderworkers' (*anshe ma'aseh*, probably the Essene 'rain-makers') took a prominent part. It closed with the beating of the willows—*ḥibbut arabah*— at the close of the feast (Sukkah IV, 1–6, cf. Ps. CXVIII, 27). The Sadducean priesthood, however, opposed it (Sukkah IV, 9; Tosefta Sukkah III, 1, 16). The ceremony was connected with the belief in the water foundation in the depth of the world's center as placed beneath the Temple mountain of Jerusalem (see Sukkah 53a, b), a belief still shared by the people, Jew and Christian, and it reaches far back in ancient Semitic life, as has been shown by Feuchtwang, *Das Wasseropfer u. d. verb. Ceremonien*, 1911 (cf. Sepp, Jerusalem, Index, s. v. Siloa).

The name Azeret in Lev. XXIII, 36 and Num. XXIX, 35 for the last day of the festival gathering seems rather to denote 'Conclusion Feast,' as is shown in Deut. XVI, 8, and as Tradition has it, which gave to the Feast of Weeks as the ending of the seven harvest weeks also the name Azereth, Aram. *Azarta* (Rosh ha-Shanah I, 2; Ḥagiga II, 4; Josephus, Ant. III, 10b).

These three festivals were adopted from the Canaanites as agricultural feasts, and, no doubt, celebrated originally in the various sacred localities according to the ancient custom, while the annual pilgrimage feast at the end of the agricultural year (Ex. XXIII, 16; XXXIV, 22) was at an early date made an especial season of gathering at the main Sanctuary of Shiloh (Ju. XXI, 19; I Sa. I, 3).

THE NEW YEAR'S DAY

The other two festivals ordained in the Priest Code (Lev. XXIII, 23–32; Num. XXIX, 1–11) have in my opinion not been satisfactorily explained as to their origin and meaning. The priest-prophet Ezekiel seems to have taken cognizance in his festal system (XLV, 18–25) of the double calendar existing already in ancient Palestine as well as in Babylonia, the agricultural one beginning in the fall (see Ezek. XL, 1) and the sacred or official one beginning in the spring (II Sam. XI, 1; I Ki. XX, 22; Jer. XXXVI, 9,

22). Accordingly he proposed an Expiation for the Temple on the first of the *first* month of the sacred calendar and another on the first of the seventh month (בשביעי באחד לחודש). This is the reading restored after LXX by Cornill, Smend, and Wellhausen. As was seen already by Ewald, the Priest Code has, in accepting the agricultural calendar beginning the year in the spring, made it its object to build the whole system of Jewish life on the holiness of the number Seven, according to which the seventh day of the week, the seventh month of the year, and again the year following the seventh time seventh year as the Jubilee year should be holy unto the Lord. Accordingly the New Moon of the seventh month, being the Sabbatical month following the six months of agricultural labor, was, in distinction from the New Moon of any other month, always ushered in by the blowing of trumpets (Numbers. X, 10), to have a more sonorous blast by the Shofar, and therefore it is called a day of memorial by blowing the horns (Lev. XXIII, 24; Num. XXIX, 1), whereas the first day of the first month of the year has nothing specific as the year's beginning. The rite of expiation of the Temple, however, is transferred from the first (on which day Ezekiel has it, XLV, 20) to the tenth of the seventh month. The reason for this must be sought in the fact that this was the ancient solar New Year's day, as Ezekiel has it in X, 1, and because the Jubilee year was according to the later legislation to begin on this day (Lev. XXV, 9-10). It was only with the introduction of the Babylonian system of the months that the first of Tishri, which denotes 'the month beginning the year,' *Tasritu* (see now Jastrow's highly interesting article 'Sumerian and Akkadian Views of Beginnings,' JAOS 36, 274-299, esp. p. 298, n. 62), became in the Jewish liturgy the New Year's Day, while it was a subject of controversy between R. Eliezer and R. Joshua of the second century whether on the first of Nisan or of Tishri the creation of the world or of man took place (Rosh Hashanah 10b-11a). Possibly the important event recorded in Neh. VIII, 2ff. of the introduction of the book of the Law by Ezra at the festal gathering on the first day of the seventh month, marked as especially 'holy', had some influence on rendering this day a great

memorial day for the future. Still the day is characterized there as one of joy and social festivity, not of a serious nature such as the New Year's day became afterwards. Unquestionably, however, it was the old Babylonian New Year's day, celebrated originally in the fall at the beginning of the seventh month Tishri (corresponding also with the seventh month of the Persian calendar named after Mithras), on which Bel Marduk or his predecessor, as the supreme deity of Babylon, sat in the mystic chamber of the fates to determine from the book of life the destiny of mankind for the coming year,¹ which gave the Jewish New Year's day its serious character as the day of divine Judgment, on which the Creator and Judge of the world assigns to all men their destiny according to their merits or demerits each year, inscribing the same in His book or books of life, finally to seal it on the Day of Atonement.

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

The great Day of Atonement, celebrated on the tenth day of the seventh month, which forms the culminating point of the Temple worship of the year, called like the Sabbath, 'a Sabbath of complete rest,' Lev. XVI, 31, has a unique character among the Jewish festivals. While obviously unknown as yet in Ezra's time (Neh. VIII), not to speak of the Solomonic time (I Ki. VIII, 65), it soon became during the second Temple 'the great Day' of the year and afterwards the most solemn holy day of the Synagogue. To account for its origin and meaning it is not sufficient to point to Ezekiel's proposed system, according to which the first day of the seventh month was like that of the first month to be a day of expiation of man's sin and of atonement for the temple (Ezek. XLV, 20), and simply to assume that the author of the Priest Code transferred it to the tenth day in order to have the New Moon of the Sabbatical month stand out as distinguished from the other New Moons of the year. We have also to consider the fact that the tenth of Tishri is called by Ezekiel (XL, 1) 'the beginning of the year,' and that the Jubilee year was actually to be proclaimed by the blowing of the horn as holy on the

Atonement day, the tenth of the seventh month, which implies that the year began on that very day (Lev. XXV, 9-10). It is obviously the solar year, in contradistinction to the lunar year, the beginning of which was to be marked according to the system recognized also in the story of the Flood (see Gen. VIII-IX, cf. VII, 11), where the difference is also one of ten days.

Here, then, the question arises whether it is likely that the strange rites prescribed in Lev. XVI, which placed the Azazel, the demon of the wilderness, in some sort of opposition to Yahweh, the Only One God of Israel, were introduced as an innovation during the second temple at a time when the religious spirit of the people and the priesthood was scarcely susceptible any more to the worship of the goat-like deities, the *Seirim* (= satyrs) against which ch. XVII, 7 warns. It was Ibn Ezra in his commentary to Lev. XVI, 8 who saw the relation of the Azazel to these demons 'of the field.' But we know from the book of Enoch, written in the second pre-Christian century, what an important role among the demons Azazel played. The Masoretic writing עֲזַזֵּל was introduced to give the name עֲזַזֵּל as found in Mandaean, Sabaeen, and Arabian mythology (Norberg, *Onomasticon*, p. 31, Brand, *Mandaäische Theologie*, p. 197f.) the meaning of a 'rugged place,' (Sifra ad loc.; Yoma 67b) instead of a 'wilderness deity.' The very spot in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, the sharp rocks (Bet Ḥadude) where the scapegoat was to be cast down to Azazel according to the Mosaic Code (Yoma VI, 8), was regarded as the place where the demon was cast down by the angel Raphael, there to remain shackled in the darkness until Judgment Day (Enoch 10, 4-5; see Charles, ad loc.). In other words, Azazel in the popular belief was the head of the demons whose dwelling was in the wilderness around Jerusalem. The sending out of the scapegoat to him laden with the sins of the people was originally, then, the cleansing of the people of all impurity in order to secure their welfare for the year just begun. It was an ancient rite dating from primitive time, to be compared with the rite concerning leprosy (Lev. XIV, 7), which has its analogies also in Babylonian rites (see Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1887, p. 461), and in all

likelihood the festal dance of the maidens on the hills of Jerusalem assigned in the Mishnah Ta'anit IV, 8 to the Atonement day and the fifteenth of Ab (August), reminding one very much of the dance of the maidens at the sanctuary of Shilo (Ju. XXI, 21), was connected with the celebration of the solar New Year's day (cf. Morgenstern JAOS 36, 324f.). The signals informing the people of the arrival of the scapegoat at its destination, the Azazel rock (Yoma VI, 8), seem to have been the inducement to open the dance on the hills.

Now it is rather strange that the date for the Atonement Day is not given at the beginning of the chapter, but in v. 29, which together with v. 30-31 did not belong to the original text. Possibly the whole law underwent changes as to date and contents. As a matter of fact the chapter is composed of many sources, as was shown by Benzinger and others (see Berthelot and Driver ad loc.). From a popular New Year festival it was transformed by the author of the Priest Code into a day of great pontifical function, and the final redactor of Leviticus in inserting v. 29-31 rendered it a Day of Atonement for the people. Later on the Pharisees invested it with a still higher or holier character in rendering it a day of prayers for repentance as well as fasting, a day of divine mercy on which the thirteen attributes of God (Ex. XXXIV, 6-7) revealed to Moses were brought home to the people as assurance of the divine forgiveness. They went even so far as to refer the words: *Ki bayom hazeh yekapper*, 'on this day he shall atone,' not to the priest but to God, who shall, through the day, have atonement for the people (Sifra to v. 30). Thus the whole idea of sacrificial worship on the Atonement Day, on which the Epistle to the Hebrews (c. 9) and Barnabas (c. 7) base their doctrine of Christ as the world's Atoning High Priest, was replaced by the prayers and litanies of the great day.

THE TETRAGRAMMATON (SHEM HA-MEFORASH) AND ITS USES

THE four-lettered Name, called *Shem ha-Meforash*,—a Hebraized Aramaic term signifying, like *Shem ha-Mejuhad*, 'the Name set apart,' or distinctive, but later on given different other meanings as a Hebrew word¹—is, in view of numerous internal and external evidences, now generally pronounced by scholars *Jahveh*², whereas the name *Jehovah*, used by the Church and defended by Galatinus, father confessor of Pope Leo X, 1518, rests on the erroneous use of the vowels intended for *Adonai*! In the pulpit and for liturgical use the pronunciation *Jahveh* ought to find no place either, as it is contrary to the tradition of the Synagogue, which points to the reading of the words: *zeh shemi leolam*, as if the last word was written *leallem*, so as to convey the meaning: This is My Name to be hidden from public use.³ In regard to this avoidance of the pronunciation of the Name Bousset (*Religion des Judenthums* 352²)⁴ has the exquisite remark: "The absolute monotheistic belief must necessarily discard the proper name of God, which is meant to distinguish Him from other gods. God, being the Only One, can have no proper name, and only such names as befittingly express His being and activity are in place. This process, unconscious to the soul of the Jewish people, was the work of the post-exilic centuries. At the same time the reason for the withdrawal of the Name was ascribed to a feeling of awe which held the Name too sacred for public utterance." Bousset, then, refers first to Job, where the name Shaddai is almost exclusively used, and then to those Psalm collections which have Elohim in place of Jahveh, and finally to the later Biblical books such as Koheleth, which use only Elohim. At any rate Jewish writers ought never to use the name except with reference to the Biblical writings, and bear in mind that Jahvism is not Monotheism. We must leave it to prejudiced writers to speak of the Jew as a worshiper of Jehovah or Jahveh. We should speak of

God only as God, or, as the Name has been substituted by Adonai at least as early as the fourth Pre-Christian century, as shown by the LXX, as *the Lord*.

THE MEANING OF J. H. V. H.

The view expressed by Stade, Budde and others that the God Jahveh was taken over from the Kenites or Midianites by Moses is, whether from a historical or psychological point of view, absurd.⁵ In the name of the God of their fathers (Ex. III, 13-15) alone could Moses come to the enslaved Hebrews to deliver them. A foreign deity could never have achieved their redemption. It is far more reasonable to surmise that the Hebrews and Midianites, being kinsmen, possessed in the Horeb plain or the Sinai peninsula a common sanctuary upon the Mountain of God, known as such to Aaron as well as to Moses and later on to Elijah (Ex. IV, 27; XVIII, 5; I Kings XIX, 8). In fact, the song of Deborah (Jud. V, 4) and the Blessing of Moses (Deut. XXX, 2) speak of J. H. V. H. as having come from the mountainous regions of the Arabic peninsula belonging to the various kinsmen of the Hebrews. Certain it is that J. H. V. H. was from beginning to end the Covenant-God of Israel who revealed himself first to Moses on Mount Horeb, according to the older Israelite tradition (Ex. III, 1; XVII, 6; Deut. IV, 10; V, 2) or Mount Sinai, according to the later Judean tradition (Ex. XIX; Deut. XXXIII, 2.)

Now the meaning given to the name J. H. V. H. by the Elohist author of Ex. III, 14-16 in connecting it with the verb *hayah*—'to become' or 'enter into existence' is obviously an artificial one. According to this the God announces himself as the One who speaks reassuringly to the people still in bondage: "Ehyeh asher Ehyeh"—'I shall be there for whatever help I am to be there'—This is thus well explained by the rabbis⁶—or simply: "Ehyeh"—'I shall be there.' When invoked in worship, however, My Name should ever be Jahveh, says He. It requires no special argument to prove that this conception of the Deity is far beyond the mental grasp of primitive people, even if we do not find in it the philosophical idea of abstract 'Being,'

as the LXX and Maimonides (Moreh I, 61) do. The root of *havah* in both the Hebrew and the Arabic—think of הָוָה Job XXXVII, 6 הָאֵמֶר לְשָׁלֹן הוּא אֶרֶץ, or הָנָה עַל הָנָה; Ez. VII, 26, and הוּחַ Ps. V, 11 and often and the Arabic هَوَى = הוּחַ 'to fall'—points unmistakably to calamitous strokes in the shape of meteoric phenomena, and so Jahveh is the God who brings about storm and lightning, hail or fire. Originally a Deity riding on the desert heights *Arabot* (Ps. LXVII, 5) and dwelling on the hills (I Kings XX, 23, 28), He marches before Israel in the wilderness in a pillar of cloud and fire, and all the later theophanies represent Him as riding on storm clouds and fiery Kerubim and the like (Ps. XVIII and XXIX, Hab. III and so forth). As commander of the heavenly hosts, not of the stars only, He is called Yahveh Zebaot, and leads as a God of War in battle against the enemies, by means of His ark of the Covenant with the symbolic Cherubim on its lid, as is especially recorded in I Sam. IV, 3–4. Indeed, the Elohist preserved for us the ancient invocation ascribed to Moses, which was made at the start of the ark: "Rise up, O Jahveh, and let Thine enemies be scattered!" and at its return: "Let Thyself down, O Jahveh, upon the myriads of the clans of Israel!" (Num. X, 35–36). Unlike, however, the Ammonite God Kemosh (Jud. XI, 24) Yahveh became through Moses' Law and the prophetic work the Covenant-God of Israel (Ex. V, 3; XXIV, 7–8) and Israel His covenant people (I Kings XIX, 10–14). Yet it took centuries of struggle and strife to transform the terrible Ruler of the Heavenly Forces, the *Paḥad Yizḥak* (Gen. XXXI, 53 comp. I Sam. XII, 10; XIV, 15), into the highest ethical principle of life, as we find Him in the classic words of Isaiah (XXXIII, 13–17), where the all-consuming fire of His nature becomes the manifestation of the loftiest morality. Indeed, the prophetic genius turned the very 'day of Jahveh' with its dreaded havoc upon the inhabitants of the earth into a day of divine discipline intended to establish justice, purity and holiness in the world. Still a wholesome dread ever surrounded the Name. The pure monotheism of the prophets was scarcely grasped by the people before the exile. The pleadings of the exilic seer, the so-called

Deutero-Isaiah, give evidence of this, and the great heritage of the prophets was taken up by a special class of '*Anavim* and *Hasidim*, whom we encounter in the Psalms, the men who formed the nucleus of the regenerated Israel, 'the Servant of the Lord.'

THE INVOCATION OF THE NAME

And here we come to a point the importance of which has not been fully recognized by the historian. In pre-exilic Israel, as among other nations, none but the priest, or some holy person, was permitted to approach the Deity in the sanctuary and invoke the name of Jahveh. Like Samuel (I Sam. XII, 19) and Jeremiah (VII, 16; XV, 1), so are Abraham (Gen. XX, 7), Moses (Ex. VIII, 24; Num. XII, 13;), and Job (XLII, 8-10), expected to pray for others (comp. Ps. XCIX, 6). Now all the stress is laid upon the pronunciation, or proclamation, of the Name. Every new altar or sanctuary was consecrated by the proclamation of the Name over it. This is the meaning of *Kara beshem* J. H. V. H. (Gen. XII, 8 and so forth, and comp. Deut. XII, 1; XIV, 23 and so forth), and, because all primitive prayer was essentially the invocation of the name of the Deity,⁷ the expression *Kara beshem* became the technical term for worship in general. (Gen. IV, 26). The term is even used (Ex. XXXIII, 19; XXXIV, 5) of Jahveh himself when He reveals His Name to Moses invested with new attributes. The rabbis count *thirteen*; an older tradition, preserved in 4 Ezra 7, 132, counts more correctly only seven attributes.

The word *beshem*, however, has been, as was shown long ago by Leopold Loew (Ges. Schr. I 187f.) and recently very extensively by Heitmüller l. c. 17-46⁸, generally misunderstood and mistranslated: *in* the Name, whereas its correct translation is: *with* the Name. Every blessing was given with the pronunciation of the Name. Thus is the priest to bless the people by putting the *Name* upon the children of Israel in order that the Lord may bless them. (Deut. X, 8; XVIII, 5, 7; XXI, 5; Num. VI, 27); and so it was always understood and carried out to the very last in the Temple (See

Sifre Num. XXXIX, 43; Sota VII, 6; Tamid. VII, 2). David blessed the people *with* the Name (II Sam. VI, 18; I Chron. XVI, 2). The harvesters were blessed *with* the Name (Ps. CXXIX, 8; comp. Ruth II, 4). The welcome given by the Psalmist to those who entered the Temple was a blessing *with* the Name (Ps. CXVIII, 26). To Goliath, who had cursed him by his God, David says (I Sam. XVII, 43-45): "Thou comest to me with sword, spear and javelin, but I come to thee *with* (not *in*!) the name of Yahveh Zebaoth, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast blasphemed." Likewise does the Levite singer at the sacrifice for the King's victory sing: "These come with chariots, and these with horses, but we offer a memorial sacrifice, (or, more correctly, incense sacrifice,) *with* the Name of Jahveh" (Ps. XX, 89.)⁹ Throughout the Psalm Hymnal the Name was pronounced by the Levitical singer in the Temple, as Leopold Loew¹⁰ points out, when Ps. CXLVIII, 13 says: "Let them praise the name of Jahveh, for His Name alone is exalted." The invocation of the Name, in the Psalmist's view, made the prayer effective to aid men in trouble (Ps. XX, 2; LIV, 3; LXXXIX, 25; CXXIV, 8) and bring defeat upon the enemy (Ps. XLIV, 6; CXVIII, 10-12). And so was the pronunciation of the Name efficacious in *cursing* men (II Kings II, 24), exactly as the priests' execration of the woman suspected of adultery was effected by the pronunciation and writing of the Name (Num. V, 21; Sifre ad. loc., comp. Lekah Tob and Yalkut). Every curse to be liable to punishment must have been made by the pronunciation of the Name (Sanh. VII, 5 and 8), as every oath was to be taken with it (Deut. VI, 13; X, 20; I Sam. XX, 42; Jer. XII, 16; Isaiah XLVIII, 1). God himself swears by His great Name (Jer. XLIV, 26).

Now the twice repeated Deuteronomic words: "By His Name shalt thou swear"—derive their real meaning from Jeremiah XII, 16, where the prophet wants the people to learn to swear by Yahveh's name: "As Yahveh liveth"—*חי יהוה*, as they had been taught to swear by Baal; comp. Ex. XXIII, 13. And if Maimonides takes these words as a positive command: "Thou shalt swear" (Sefer ha Mizwot I, 7; H. Shebu'ot XI, 1) and Nahmanides in a permissive

sense: "Thou mayest swear," while the Midrash (Tanḥ. Mat-tot I), connecting them with the preceding words, says: "Only when thou truly fearest the Lord thy God and servest Him only and cleavest to Him, thou mayest swear by His Name, not otherwise"—this has no longer anything to do with the pronunciation of the Name, which was, as we shall see, already during the second Temple declared as forbidden, the very word *לשון* in the third of the Ten Commandments being taken to mean 'in vain' (Targ. *למנוּה*—for futility or to no purpose.)

During the Exile the Name was very emphatically used in contrast to other deities, especially so by Deutero-Isaiah, who constantly dwells on the absolute Unity of Jahveh in contrast to Persian Dualism (Isai. XLV, 7). And it was undoubtedly in contrast to the Parsee invocation of the god of light at the sunrise, or sunset, that the recital of the Deuteronomic verse Shema—"Hear O Israel, Yahveh is our God, Yahveh the One"—was introduced by the pious Jews in the Exile. This was done originally in the *open*, where the corresponding prayers prepared the devout ones for the sight of the rising sun; and in accordance with the Deuteronomic verse: "When I proclaim the name of Yahveh, ascribe ye greatness unto our God" (Deut. XXXII, 3f., Sifre); the assembly responded: "Blessed be the Name of His glorious Sovereignty forever and aye!"—a custom which was retained long after the pronunciation of the Name had been abrogated.

AVOIDANCE OF THE NAME

Since the exile, however, reverence for, 'the great,' 'the glorious and awful Name' (Deut. XXVIII, 58) grew to such an extent that its use was more and more restricted. Trito-Isaiah (Is. LXV, 16) recommends for blessings and for oaths the name *Elohe Amen* 'the God of faithfulness' as a substitute. The seer in Zech. XIV, 9, when voicing the hope for a time when 'Jahveh shall become King of the whole earth,' says, no doubt, with reference to Deut. VI, 4: "On that day Jahveh will be One and His Name: *One*." The monotheistic doctrine certainly reached its highest

triumph when the Name as the proper name of God was withdrawn from public use, and the name *Adonai*, with which the Greek 'Kyrios' corresponds and hence the 'Lord' in all translations of the Scripture, was substituted for it. Dr. Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes*, p. 165, is probably right in his argument that the Chronicler, who never writes אֲדֹנָי as his source II Sam. VII, 18-29, has it, must have regularly read *Adonai* for J. H. V. H. And so do the Targumim. It is very improbable that the Alexandrian Jews should have introduced the name 'the Lord' for Jahveh, as Geiger thinks (*Urschrift* 262). They would have used the term *ha-shem*, found by them already in Lev. XXIV, 11. Geiger is, furthermore, mistaken when he takes the tradition (*Tosefta Sota* XIII 8; *Yoma* 39b) to mean that, after the death of Simon the Just, the Name was no longer pronounced in the temple. It only tells, as Blau and Jacob correctly state, that on account of the death of the great personality which followed so soon after the premonition he had when officiating in the Holy of Holies, his associates abstained *for the time being* from pronouncing the Name in their priestly blessing. Only outside of the Temple the Name was not pronounced by the priests, and its by-name (*Kinnuy*) *Adonai* substituted (*Sota* VII, 6; *Tamid* VII, 2). This is confirmed also by Philo (*Vita Moses* III, 111; comp. *Book of Wisdom* XIV, 21 and *Josephus Ant.* II, 12, 4). Towards the close of the Temple period the tendency prevailed to keep the Name altogether from the people's reach, and so R. Tarfon (*Kid.* 11a) relates that, when as a lad accompanying his uncle to the Temple platform to join them in the priestly blessing, he heard [the high priest, 'swallow up' the Name amidst the chanting of his brethren. A similar tradition, *Tosefta Ber.* VI, 23, records that, owing to a time of decadence, the Name was 'swallowed up,' that is, made inaudible. Whatever trustworthiness there is to be attached to the Mishnaic tradition that the high-priest's voice at the tenfold pronunciation of the Name on the Day of Atonement was heard as far as Jericho (*Tamid* III, 8; *Yoma* 39b), it appears that only the first syllable *Yah*, as in *Hallelu Yah*, was heard, the rest remained indistinct. In connection with this, another tradition, but scarcely preserved in its original

form, tells (Kid. 71a) that the Name of twelve letters¹¹ (Read: of four letters) was formerly entrusted to all, but when the arrogant ones (Hellenists) increased in number, it was entrusted only to the Zenuim—the Essenes ('the modest ones') among the priesthood, and they 'swallowed it up in the chanting of their brethren.' The preceding Talmudic passage has a tradition of R. Johanan, the great Amoraic authority for ancient traditions, that the *four-lettered* Name was communicated by the wise to their trusted disciples only once every seventh year. Ultimately the pronunciation of the Name was not merely forbidden to the layman, but declared by R. Levi to be a deadly sin (Pesik. d. R. K. 148a, with reference to Lev. XXIV, 16, where the word *Nokeb* is taken also by the LXX (comp. Targum) in the sense of pronouncing, instead of cursing). The Mishnaic rule (Ber. IX, 5) that on meeting a fellow we might, or should, greet him with the Name, as was done by the harvesters of Boaz and the angel addressing Gideon, does in my opinion not imply, as Geiger l. c., Dr. Jacob, and also Schechter Aspects of Rab. Theol. p. 45 think, that the use of the Tetragrammaton is recommended. How could, if this were so, the knowledge of the Name have so easily fallen into oblivion? The rule has simply the usual name Adonai in view. As to the motive compare Meg. 3a giving evidence of the fear of encountering demons in the guise of men.

THE MAGICAL USE OF THE NAME

Among those who have no share in the world to come (Sanh. X, 1; Tos. Sanh. XII, 9–10) Abba Saul counts 'him who spells the Name in its literal form' (*Ha-hogeh et ha-shem beotiotav*). This means the one who uses the Name for a magic spell, exactly as does the 'one who whispers over a wound or plague' mentioned afterwards and ascribed in the Tosefta to Abba Saul. This practice is condemned also by Hillel who says: "He who makes use of the Crown perishes" (Abot I, 13). The term *Taga* is explained in Ab. d. R. Nathan (Ed. Schechter 56) as referring to the *Shem ha-Meforash*. Later on, however, another meaning was given to the word, and it was taken to refer to the crown of the

Torah by R. Lakish (Meg. 28b; comp. Ned. 62a; Yalk. to Daniel 1063). It is easy to see that the change of meaning was made intentionally. A tradition preserved by Abba bar Kahana tells us that the Men of the Great Synagogue and the generation of martyrs of the Hadrianic persecution made use of the *Shem ha-Meforash* (Midr. Teh. to Ps. XXXVI, 2, where the words: "They who know Thy Name" are referred to), As to the Men of the Great Synagogue we are told (Yoma 69b) that Ezra, when 'he blessed Jahveh, the Great God' (Neh. VIII, 6), pronounced the Name, and this interpretation is followed by the quaint story that the Men of the Great Synagogue under the leadership of the prophet Zechariah by pronouncing the Name banished the spirit of idolatry, hitherto so prevalent. Of the ten martyrs of the Hadrianic persecution we find Hanina ben Teradion singled out as having made magical use of the Name in public and thereby brought divine punishment upon himself (Ab. Zarah 18a; Bacher Ag. Tan. I, 400 incorrectly: by the pronunciation of the Name). The whole passage in Midr. Shoher Tob. Ps. XXXVI, 11 (ed. Buber 251f.), which mentions also the generation of Hezekiah and Zedekiah as having made magical use of the Name, has its parallel in a remark by Joshua ben Levi in the name of Pinhas ben Yair: "The prayers of Israelites in this world are not answered from lack of knowledge of the *Shem ha-Meforash*; in the world to come," however, God will himself impart the knowledge to them in accordance with Ps. XXXVI, 11 and Isai. LII, 6 (Midr. Teh. Ps. XCI, ed. Buber 400).¹² The term crown = (*Atarah*) used in a metaphorical sense of the attributes of God we find in connection with the Men of the Great Synagogue (Yoma 69b): "They restored the Crown to its pristine glory." On the other hand, we learn from Pirke d. R. Eliezer (comp. Hekaloth, Jellinek B. H. II 46) that God himself wears a crown upon which the Name is engraved.¹³ So, we are told (Ber. 7a) did the high priest Jishmael ben Elisha, in a vision of the Temple, see the Crown-angel Akatriel standing behind the throne of the Most High and bless Him. At a later time his place was taken by an angel set over prayer, who takes the prayers rising from the Synagogues to weave them into crowns and

place them upon the head of the Most High (Ex. R. XXI with reference to עֲדִיךָ Psalm LXV, 3 and עֲדִי in Isai. XLIX, 18). But this very word עֲדִי = jewel has a remarkable history with the mystics. The עֲדִי = jewel which the Israelites laid aside after their sin of the Golden Calf (Ex. XXXIII, 4-6), was taken, according to R. Johanan's tradition and with reference to עֲדִיךָ = 'thy jewel' in Ps. CIII, 5, by the mystic Simeon b. Yohai, to signify a crown, or a jewel on the belt or sword-hilt, with the Name engraved upon it (Pesik. d. R. K. 124b; Pesik. R. 154a; Midr. Teh. ed. Buber 435; comp. 397; Tanh. Waera ed. Buber 25; Pirk. d. R. El. XLVII; Targ. Yer. to Ex. XXXII, 25; XXXIII, 4, 6; Eka. R. II, 21 to v. 77; comp. Shab. 88a and Bacher l. c. II, 118). In this connection must be mentioned also the Sword of Moses with the Name engraved thereon which is made the subject of the mystic work *Harba di Moshe* edited by Gaster. Also the staff of Moses with which he divided the Red Sea, had, according to R. Nehemiah, the Name engraved upon it (Pesik d. R. K. 140a; Ex. R. I, 33; Lev. R. XXXII, 4). Especially does the Targ. Yer. frequently refer to the miraculous power of the Name (See Ex. XV, 25; XXVIII, 30; Num. XXXI, 8; Deut. IX, 19).

On the extensive use of this supposed magic power of the Name in Jewish and in non-Jewish circles see Blau l. c. and Heitmüller l. c. (To ascribe all this to Egyptian or late heathen influence and call the Essenes magicians and sorcerers, as Jacob l. c. does, is, to say the least, unhistorical). The Essenes צנועים—to whom all mysteries of the Holy Name as well as the other Invocations—*Azkarot*—were entrusted in connection with the *Ma'aseh Merkabah* (Ḥag. II, 1 and see J. E. art. *Merkabah*) were none else than the *Hasidim we Anshe Ma'aseh*—'the Saintly Ones and the Miracle workers' mentioned in connection with the Water libation festivities in Sukkah V, 43, the last representative of whom was the popular prayer hero Ḥanina ben Dosa (Sota IX, 15), well-characterized by Isaac Hirsch Weiss in his notes *Mekilta Yithro* p. 68 as an Essene wonder worker. The best illustration of such an Essene wonder worker is furnished in Ta'an. III, 8 in Onias, the Rain-maker, or, as the people called him, *ha-Meaggel*—'the one who used to

draw a circle' around him for his prayer (comp. Josephus Ant. XIV, 21). Believing, as all the ancient Ḥasidim did (Ber. V, 1) that by their intense devotion they come into the closest personal relation to God as their 'Father in heaven,' he shut himself up in the hole he had digged—thus the story runs—and prayed: "O Master of the World, Thy children look upon me as a son of Thy household, and so I swear by Thy great *Name* that I shall not leave this spot, before Thou in Thy mercy hast sent down rain." It then rained in drops, but he bruskiy said: "Not this kind of rain, but one that fills the cisterns and dykes I have asked for," whereupon the rain come down in torrents; and again he said: "Not for such rain, but for a rain of blessing and good-will I have asked." Finally after the rain had lasted a good while, he was asked by the people to stop it by his prayer, and he did so. But there word came to him from Simeon ben Shetaḥ, the Pharisean leader: I would have excommunicated thee but for the fact that thou art Onias. What can I do to thee who standest in such familiar relations to the Most High as a wilful son does to his father and he fulfills his wishes, for of thee it may be said: "Let thy father and thy mother be glad, and let her that bore thee rejoice" (Prov. XXIII, 25)—We have in this instructive narrative, further enlarged in the Talmud (Ta'an. 23a), a striking characteristic of the typical *Essene*, who does not hesitate to force his will upon God by the use of the *Great Name* in his prayer, and the typical *Pharisee* who condemns such practice. How far the theurgical use of the Name and of other names of God and the angelic host surrounding Him influenced both the teaching and the practice of the mystic class of *Essaioi*, = חֲשִׁאִים, or *Essenes*, = צְנוּעִים is a subject which has scarcely been considered by those who, relying upon the scanty material furnished by Josephus and Philo, wrote on Essenism, this so-called enigma of Jewish history.

SHEMA YISRAEL

ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF ITS DAILY RECITAL

THROUGHOUT the entire realm of literature, secular or sacred, there is probably no utterance to be found that can be compared in its intrinsic intellectual and spiritual force, or in the influence it exerted upon the whole thinking and feeling of civilized mankind, to the six words of the Deuteronomic verse (VI, 6) which have become the battle-cry of the Jewish people for more than twenty-five centuries. The little Jewish child learns to stammer them forth when first folding its tiny hands in prayer, while the dying son of Israel whispers them forth peacefully with his last breath,—the words: "Hear O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One." As to the meaning of the Scriptural verse there ought to be no dispute among scholars of the various denominations or religious views. The suggestion made by Prof. George F. Moore in his recent work, (*History of Religions, II: Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism*, p. 23) that 'there was a Jehovah of Beersheba and a Jehovah of Hebron and a Jehovah of Jerusalem' and 'they were in the apprehension of the worshipers at these shrines distinct,' has no foundation or justification anywhere in Scripture, and is only made to support the wrong translation of modern commentators: Jehovah our God is *one* Jehovah. There were many *Ba'alim* and Ashtarot, differentiated by their various shrines, but there was only one and the same Jahveh in Israel, also in the pre-prophetic period. The predicate 'Eḥad' refers to the preceding Elohenu rather than to Jahveh, and, as frequently done in Hebrew,¹ we have to supply Eloha and translate Jahveh is *one*, that is the *only* one, God; or, as it has also been translated, in the sense in which the word *Eḥad* is used in I Chron. XVII, 21: "Who is like Thy people Israel 'goy ehad baaretz'—a unique people on earth." The meaning *One* emphasizing the Unity of God, however, seems to be preferable in view of the pas-

sage in Zechariah XIV, 9: "And Jahveh will be King over the whole earth; on that day Jahveh will be One, and His name One," which obviously refers to our Deuteronomic verse and predicts the universal triumph of the monotheistic faith of Israel. Certain it is that only the declaration of the absolute morotheistic faith forms the right basis for the following verse inculcating the duty of the whole-hearted love for Jahveh as Israel's God. At any rate the *Unity* of God in its absolute sense implies *Uniqueness*, or Soleness, and Driver in his Commentary is right in saying that both verses 'express the fundamental truth of Israel's religion, the uniqueness and unity of God and the fundamental duty founded upon it, the devotion to Him of the Israelite's whole being.'

Now it was undeniably the stroke of a true religious genius, or, to use the Rabbinical term, the prompting of the holy spirit to select, as Prof. Steinthal once expressed it,² out of the 4875 verses of the Pentateuch this one verse as the inscription on Israel's banner of victory. But shall we ascribe the recital of the Shema each morning and evening to the Men of the Great Synagogue, as Zunz does?³ This view, accepted as it is by many writers, is in direct contradiction to the Rabbinical tradition which nowhere regards the Shema recital as a Soferic institution, but takes it to be a biblical command. It was unquestionably taken as such by the schools of Shammai and Hillel, which derived even their different modes of recital of the Shema in the evening and morning from the Deuteronomic verses: "And thou shalt speak of them . . . when thou liest down and when thou risest up." (Berakot I, 3). Josephus has the same tradition in view when he ascribes to Moses (IV, 8, 13) the commandment 'to remember God's benefit bestowed upon Israel at their deliverance from Egypt, and this *twice every day*, both when the day begins and when the hour of sleep comes on.' He obviously already had the three portions of the Shema, Deut. VI, 4-9; XI, 13-21, and Num. XV, 37-41, in view, the last verse of which alludes to the deliverance from Egypt. It is interesting to notice the introductory sentence to the Shema in the Septuagint, which reads: "And these are the statutes and ordinances which the Lord commanded to the

children of Israel in the wilderness, as they went forth from Egypt." It shows that the Shema was read with this introduction in the Alexandrian Synagogue.

It scarcely needs a special argument to prove that, though the Sopherim connected the Deuteronomic verse with the Shema recital, just as they did the Thephilin and the Mezuzah with the following verses,—as is shown also in Josephus in the above quoted paragraph—the origin and the purpose of the Shema must be sought elsewhere. As the name *Kabbalat Ol Malkut Shamayim*, given it by the Pharisean teachers, indicates, it was meant to be 'the solemn acceptance of the yoke of God's sovereignty,' which is the same as the declaration of Israel's fundamental belief in God's unity in opposition to the polytheistic belief of the heathen world. And there the question comes home to us: At what period in Jewish history was such a declaration deemed appropriate, or necessary? Prof. L. Blau wisely suggests (*Revue des Etudes Juives* XXXI, p. 181) that it was in view of the Persian Dualism, against which Deutero-Isaiah so emphatically enters his protest, while hailing Cyrus, the Persian conqueror, as God's anointed (Isai, XLV, 7), that this proclamation of God's Unity twice a day was introduced in the Synagogue. But in making the Mishnaic description of the Shema recital in the Hall of the Hewn Stones at the Temple, the seat of the Sanhedrin (Tamid V, 1), the starting-point of his study, Prof. Blau failed to consider that neither the place nor the time of this morning service of the priests gave an especial impulse to such a solemn confession of the Jewish faith in opposition to the Persian dualism, nor, in fact, would this account for the dating of the institution back to Mosaic times. Least of all should the priests of the Temple, whom Blau, following Dr. Buechler, identifies with the *Watikim*, mentioned in the Talmud (Ber. 9b and elsewhere) as having finished the recital of the Shema every morning at the time of the Radiation of the Sun,—*behanetz ha-Hammah*,—be credited with the introduction of this most important element of the Synagogical liturgy.

Prof. I. Elbogen, in his work *Der Juedische Gottesdienst in s. geschichtl. Entwicklung*, offers a theory concerning the origin of the Shema recital, and, while he constantly

speaks of it as the confession of Israel's faith ('Bekennntniss'), he does not even mention the characteristic term: *Kabbalat Ol Malkut Shamayim*. He agrees, however (see p. 236) with my views, as expressed in the *Monatsschrift*, 1893, 441ff, that the Temple practice described in *Tamid V*, 1 was not original with the priests, but a compromise, a concession to the real founders of the Synagogal liturgy in the Exile. He might have gone much farther, though, especially in his article on *Die aelteste Rabbinische Quelle ueber die Liturgie* in the Kohler volume, *Studies in Jewish Literature*, Berlin, 1913, and have pointed out more strongly the fact that the priestly *Mishmar* service had the Shema recital materially altered by omitting one of the two benedictions preceding the Shema, and by having, strangely enough, the Decalogue precede the Shema, notwithstanding the great importance of the latter as the main Jewish confession. It is actually the *Torah* represented by the four chapters read, and not the declaration of the faith, which appears here as the object of the service, and this corresponds indeed more with the original meaning of the Scriptural verse: "And thou shalt speak of them," and so forth. Moreover, the second of the two benedictions, the one called *Birkat ha-Torah*, 'Blessing over the Torah,' is the only one befitting this service in the *Liskat ha-Gazit*. So all this casts no light upon the original practice.

Recognizing, however, that the Shema recital originated in the Congregational or Synagogal service, Elbogen offers a theory of his own concerning its mode of recital. Finding in all the Rabbinic, Mishnaic, Midrashic and Geonic writings the technical term *Pores al Shema* for the Reader who leads in the recital, and the form of its recital described in the *Tosefa* and both *Talmuds* of *Sotah* as well as in the *Mekilta* as an antiphonal recitation, that is, as alternating in half-verses between the reader and the Congregation, he explains the term *Pores al Shema* as breaking each verse of the Shema in two. The Reader is thus supposed to have first recited the *two* words: *Shema Yisrael*, to which the Congregation responds reciting the next *four* words, and no sooner has he heard the Name of the Lord uttered forth twice by the Congregation than he responded with the same

words with which the Congregation responded on the Atonement Day to the High Priest's pronouncement of the Holy Name in the Temple: "Blessed be the Name of His Glorious Kingdom forever and aye." But, says Elbogen, he spoke these words only in a whisper, whereas the Congregation, on hearing the High Priest's pronouncement in the Temple, responded aloud. The men of Jericho, however, of whom the Mishnah (Pesahim IV, 8) says that they 'folded the Shema together'—*hayu korkin et Shema*—had no such antiphonal break of the verses, and, therefore, there was no pause left for the response.

This whole theory, developed at length in his *Studien z. Gesch. d. jued. Gottesd.*, and, despite all opinions to the contrary, adopted and defended in his main work, p. 514–515, leaves altogether unexplained, as was especially pointed out by Bacher, the preposition *al* instead of *et* and, furthermore, the transfer of the term *Pores* to the Benediction *Yoser Or*, which, preceding the Shema, contains the thanksgiving to God for the light of day, not to speak of other minor difficulties.

But the chief objection is that the term *paras al*, as has been shown by Herzfeld, Bacher, and others, occurs frequently as equivalent to 'offer Benediction or Prayer,'⁴ and can have only one meaning, viz., to lift up the hands to heaven while pronouncing the Name of God, the word for hands having been dropped by common use. This gesture was deemed inseparable from leading the Congregation in prayer, and hence it became the special technical term for the recital of the Shema and also for the Benediction preceeding the same.

And now let us see whether we cannot trace the whole practice to a more ancient time than the Talmudic sources suggest. We have first of all Josephus' description of the Essene practice (Jewish War II, 8, 5): "Before the rising of the sun they speak of no profane matters, but send up toward it certain prayers that have come down to them from their forefathers, as if they were praying for its rising." This was identified already by Rapoport in his *Biography of Kalir* (Bikk. ha-Itthim X, 118) with the practice of the *Watikim* 'the Strongminded'—that is, preservers of ancient

traditions—of whom we are told that they started their prayers at dawn and managed to conclude them with the recital of the Shema at the time of the Radiation of the Sun. (Ber. 9b, 25b–26a). Similarly are the Therapeutes, an Egyptian branch of the Essenes, described by Philo (*De Vita Contemplativa*, Mangey II 475, 485) as ‘praying twice a day, at dawn and in the evening;’ ‘as standing’ up with their faces and their whole body turned towards the dawn’ and ‘lifting their hands towards heaven when they see the sun rise, praying for a happy day and for the light of truth and penetrating wisdom.’ Here we have a direct allusion even to the two Benedictions preceding the Shema, the one thanking for the light of day, the other for the Torah. That neither the Essenes nor the Therapeutes had anything to do with Persian sun-worship, as we are persistently told by Christian writers, even such men as Schuerer and Lightfoot, needs no argument. We have, on the contrary, other references to the same practice, one in the third portion of the Book of Wisdom, a fragment of a Hellenistic Passover Haggadah, (XVI, 28), where with reference to the Manna which ‘melted as the sun grew hot,’ it is said: “This is to teach us that we should anticipate the sun in offering thanksgivings to Thee, and pray unto Thee at the rising of the light of day.” The other passage is in the third book of the Sibyllines, v. 591f.: “They lift up to heaven their pure hands, rising early from their bed in the morning, having always their hands cleansed in water.” Evidently the class of Ḥasidim, spoken of here under various names, assembled in the open field where they could watch the sun rise from daybreak on, and beginning with early prayers, they greeted the sun as it appeared in full radiance ‘over the hills’ with uplifted hands; while solemnly reciting the Jewish watchword taken from Deuteronomy “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One.” But instead of the later pronunciation *Adonay* they, or rather, the chosen leader of the service, having taken his morning bath or purification, as was the custom of those laic saints, pronounced the sacred Name *Jahveh* twice in the Shema, and forthwith the assembly, exactly as they did on the Day of Atonement in the Temple, responded *aloud*: “Blessed be the name of His glorious Kingdom for

ever and aye." Cf. Deut. 32, 3. Later on, when Adonay took the place of the sacred Name, the response was said in a whisper; but it had become too much of an integral part of the Shema recital as to be given up entirely. Only the men of Jericho would not pause after the first verse of the Shema, but had it so closely connected with the following,—that is, had it 'folded up' with the rest,—that there was no room left for the response. As to the Midrashic parallel of Jacob responding in the same formula to his twelve sons when they addressed him in the words of the Shema, Elbogen overlooked the important words פִּירֵשׁ בְּשִׁפְחוֹי, 'Hearing them mention the name Adonay, he pronounced the *Shem ha-meforash* and responded for them in the well-known formula'. (See Bereshit R. LXXVIII; Sifre Deut. XXXI).

Having thus come to the conclusion that the practice originated neither in the Temple nor in the Synagogue, but in the open, under the free heaven, we can easily see *when* and *where* the impulse to the Shema recital was given. We need only think of the Mazdean worshipers who, as we learn from the Avesta,⁵ every morning hailed the rising sun-god Mithras with the sacred prayer formula *Ashem Vohu* and likewise followed the setting sun with a similar prayer, to find here the strongest possible incentive for the pious Jew to adopt the same impressive ceremony, but at the same time render it a demonstrative declaration of the Unity and Uniqueness of Israel's God in opposition to the Zoroastrian dualism. This is not the place to show how much the Synagogue in its doctrinal and liturgical elements adopted in the course of time from Parseeism, whose ethical and spiritual character among the pagan religions strongly appealed to the Jewish mind. As a matter of fact, when we read that Daniel prayed three times a day, that is, morning, evening, and at noon, (Dan. VI, 11), as did the Psalmist (Ps. LV, 10), we can only think of the Persian prototype. (See Spiegel 1. c.).

The next logical step taken by those laic saints was to affirm this declaration of Israel's monotheistic faith in the strongest possible language, and this was done in the half Hebrew half Aramaic *Emet we-Yatzib*, in which the accumulation of the terms indicates its laic origin. That it is very

old is shown, in that not only has it been adopted as part of the Shema in the Temple service (Ta'anit V. 1) but, as Elbogen rightly argues, the Tanna R. Jehuda declares its recitation to be a Biblical command (Ber. 21a). It became an integral part of the Shema as the Confession of Faith. (Comp. Elbogen, Studien p. 28-29).

The proper introduction of the Shema and the right preparation for it was most assuredly the Benediction *Yozer Or* with its direct allusion to the words of Deutero-Isaiah (XLV, 7), though the Ḥasidim, who on a later stage would no longer ascribe *evil* to God himself, changed the word *ra'*—evil, into *hakkol*—all. It was undoubtedly originally very brief. Only the second sentence, accentuating God's mercy in giving light to the earth and His goodness in daily renewing the work of creation, is of Hasidean origin, as the term *Ma'aseh Bereshit*, created by them, shows. The second Benediction, dwelling on the love of God for Israel manifested by the Torah, is by no means older than the first, as Elbogen (D. jued. Gottesd., p. 15) maintains, overlooking the fact that it does not even begin with the usual *Baruk*. As a matter of fact it refers to the second verse: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart" and to the other verses speaking of the words of the Torah. It represents a later stage of the Shema recital, just as does the closing Benediction referring to Israel's deliverance from Egypt.

In the meantime the older Ḥasidean practice of facing the rising sun at the recital of the Shema seems to have given offence, as it was regarded as a rather pagan practice (See Sukkah V, 16 and comp. Ezek. VIII, 16), and only a few, more inclined to retain it, loved to recite the Shema with the prayers morning and evening at the time when the sky was 'reddened by the rising or setting sun.' This sentiment was especially voiced by the saintly Jose ben Ḥalafta when he said: "May my portion (of heavenly bliss) be with those who pray when the sun reddens the sky." (See Ber. 29b; Shab. 118b; Yer. IV, 7b; Jose b. Ḥanina in Babli is a copyist's mistake caused by the preceding sentence.)

Both the Watikim Ber. 9b and the Amoraim in the passage quoted, refer to the Psalm verse (LXXII, 5): "They

fear Thee (O God!) with the sun, and before the moon (is seen) for all generations."

As the original purpose of the Shema recital was altogether lost sight of, and it assumed the character of a legal ordinance, its mode of recital underwent many changes. While the schools of Shammai and Hillel differed as to whether the words 'When thou liest down and when thou risest up' are to be taken literally so as to indicate the position of lying down in the evening and of standing up in the morning at the Shema recital, or whether the words 'when thou sittest in thy house' imply any other position as well (Ber. I, 3), a late Midrash (Pes. d. R. K. ed. Buber 77a) stresses the latter words so as to make the position of sitting almost the rule.

On the other hand, Israel's martyrdom as typified in Rabbi Akiba (Sifre Deut. VI, 5) invested the Shema Yisrael with a sanctity unattained before, and great stress was laid on the devotion with which it is to be recited (Ber. 13ab). Persecution during the Middle Ages, which has given rise to the Shema recital with the Benediction: "Blessed be Thou who causest Thy Name to be sanctified (through martyrdom) amidst the multitude of men" at the beginning of the daily liturgy, constantly heightened the impressiveness of the Shema, and made the pious Jew of later times actually feel that, like Akiba, he, too, was ready to give up his soul to testify to Israel's belief in the absolute Unity of God. Nor was the ethical corollary forgotten. The same ancient Midrash which says: "The Lord is One and therefore universal, but, being our God, He imposes upon us the duty of proclaiming His Unity throughout the world," (Sifre ibidem) has on the following verse the remarkable comment: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God not merely for thyself, but thou shalt make Him beloved by thy fellow-creatures through thy whole conduct toward them." Thus is the command: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" actually included in the command: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." Thus the principle of love as self-surrender comprises God and humanity.

THE PSALMS AND THEIR PLACE IN THE LITURGY

OF ALL the inspired writings of the world the Book of Psalms surely is mankind's holiest treasury of inspiration. Like no other book of Holy Writ, it thrilled the ages with faith and hope. The Psalter of David has justly been called the harp of mankind. It has at all times yielded forth the sweetest music for the human heart and responded to its deepest emotions of joy and grief, of fear and hope, of woe and triumph. It has become the companion and comforter of Christian and Jew, the solace of sinner and saint, the friend of hut and palace. Its cheering strains reared temples and synagogues, cathedrals and chapels, led armies to victory and martyrs to glorious triumph, steeled a Luther and a Cromwell to fortitude, and sent angelic peace to millions of troubled souls. To the Psalms, our poetry, our modern music, nay, the Reformation itself, owe their highest achievements. The Jew-baiter, who but recently advised Christianity to cast off the Old Testament as being 'a mill-stone around its neck,' forgot, in his folly, that the Church's text-book of song is—the Psalter of David.

What is religion but worship? The Psalms gave it for all time its purest and loftiest form. They taught man how to offer God the pure incense of devotion. The prophet struck the keynote of religion in pointing to the God within, to the God of righteousness. The Law and the Prophets voice, in no uncertain accents, the faith universal of man. No matter what ethnology may say to the contrary, the Book of Law points out the great truth that the first man was the first worshipper of God, and Israel's seers hold forth the hope of a universal worship of God in righteousness and truth at the end of human history. Still, nowhere does the universal character of Judaism find so full an expression as it does in the Psalms. There the soul communes with God, its Maker, pouring out all its cares and laying down all its burdens before His throne of mercy, to be winged

with new hope and courage. As Luther says: "Here you can look deeply into the heart of all the saints as into a mirror, and through the storm of passion that sweeps over it, and through the clouds of doubt that hide the light of day, you behold God coming to cheer and to rescue them."

COMPARISON OF THE PSALMS WITH THE GATHAS AND VEDAS
AND BABYLONIAN HYMNS

In order to illustrate the matchless beauty and grandeur of the Psalms, let us select such hymns as represent the highest stage of religious poetry among other nations and compare them with ours. Let us first take the scared songs of the Aryan of old, of the Gathas of Zoroaster, and of the Vedas of the Hindoo priests. They all, without exception, portray or reflect the struggle not of the human soul, but of the God addressed. They present religion dramatized, not focused in man. They are not the cry for the living God, but a demand for some divine manifestation.

The hymn containing the declaration of the Zoroastrian faith, taken from the 30th Yashna, translated by Mills, in Max Mueller's *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXXI, is as follows:

"Now I will proclaim, O ye who draw near and wish to be taught, the thoughts about the all-knowing one, the praises for the Lord Ahura and the sacrifices which come from the Good Mind and the benignant meditations inspired by Righteousness. May propitious results be seen in the light.

"Hear then with your ears; see the bright flames with the Better Mind. Choose ye, each for himself, between the two teachings:

"The two primeval spirits as twins, independent in action, are Good and Evil—in thought, in word, in deed. Between these two the wise make the right choice; not so the evil-doers.

"When the two spirits came together at first to make life and death, and to decree how the world shall be ordered, for the wicked wretchedness and for the holy blessedness,

"Then the Evil chose to do evil, and the Good Spirit, he who clothes himself with the firmament as his robe, chose righteousness, and also those who wish to do right in the eyes of Ahura Mazda.

"Between these the demons can make no righteous choice, for folly hath overcome them. When they held counsel together, they chose the Evil Mind. And they rushed together into the demon of Violence (Aeshma) to afflict the life of man.

"But when the vengeance cometh upon these wretches, the Kingdom shall have been gained for Thee, Ahura Mazda, by thy Good Will to those who help Truth to overcome Falsehood.

"May we be of those who lead this life to perfection. May we be like thee, Ahura, working in union with righteousness. Let our minds be where wisdom shall abide. Then shall destruction come upon the Spirit of Falsehood, but in the happy abode of the Good Mind and of Ahura the righteous saints shall gather who are walking in the path of honour."

Compare this Persian hymn with the 1st Psalm, which likewise dwells on the *Two Roads of Life*:

1. Happy the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly,
Nor stands in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of scorers.
2. But in the law of the Lord is his delight,
And on His law he meditates day and night.
3. He shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water,
That bringeth forth its fruit in its season, nor will its leaf wither;
And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.
4. Not so are the ungodly;
They are like the chaff which the wind driveth away.
5. Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment,
Nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous.
6. For the Lord taketh knowledge of the way of the righteous,
But the way of the ungodly perisheth.

How far superior in human pathos and in simple truth is the Hebrew Psalm!

Or take the hymn expressing the longing and doubts of the Persian seer (Yashna XLIV):

"This I ask thee, O Ahura, tell me aright:
How shall praise be offered to thee, that through thy Good Mind thou mayest draw near us?
This I ask thee, O Ahura, tell me aright:
Who was the father of the righteous order?
Who sustaineth the earth here below, and the space above, that they do not fall?
Who gave sun and stars their unfailing course?
Who established the waxing and the waning of the moon save Thee?
This I ask thee, O Ahura, tell me aright:
Who made the waters and the plants? Who to the wind hath yoked the storm-clouds?
Who is the inspirer of the good thoughts?
This I ask thee, O Ahura, tell me aright:
Who as a skillful artisan hath made light and darkness?
Who hath made sleep and walking? Who the dawn, the moon and the midnight as guides of duty?
Who created piety? Who made the son revere his father?

This I ask thee, O Ahura, tell me aright:

Let me ponder on Thy revelations, whereby we may through Thine
Order obtain this life's perfection. How may my soul with joy
increase in goodness?

This I ask thee, O Ahura, tell me aright:

That holy faith—how shall it further thy order?

How shall I banish the spirit of Evil from the friends of Righteousness!"

Is this to be compared to the 8th Psalm?

"O Lord, our God, how excellent is Thy name over all the earth!

Thou whose glory resoundeth in the heavens!

Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings Thou hast established a
stronghold

For Thine adversaries' sake to silence the enemy and the vengeful.

When I behold Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers,

The moon and the stars which Thou hast established:

What is man that Thou art mindful of him?

And the son of man that Thou rememberest him?

Yet Thou hast made him little less than divine beings,

And hast crowned him with honour and glory.

Thou gavest him dominion over the works of Thine hands;

Thou hast put all things beneath his feet:

Flocks and herds of the fold

And also beasts of the field,

The birds of heaven and the fishes of the sea;

Yea, he traverseth the paths of the seas.

O Lord, our God, how excellent is Thy name over all the earth!"

Or to the 24th Psalm?

"The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof,

The world and they that dwell therein.

For He hath founded it upon the seas,

And established it upon the floods.

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord?

Or who shall stand in His holy place?

He that hath clean hands and a pure heart,

Who hath not lifted up his soul unto falsehood, nor sworn deceitfully.

He shall receive blessing from the Lord and righteousness from the
God of his salvation."

Here is no room left for doubt. God lives in every word
and deed and thought of the singer.

A few specimens of Vedic hymns, selected as the best
by Max Mueller, may here follow. They were composed
in honor of Varuna, the all-seeing god of the sky:

"Varuna, the great Lord of these worlds seeth as if he were near. If
a man thinks he is walking by stealth, the gods know it all.

"If a man stand, or walk, or hide, if he lie down or rise up, what two people sitting together whisper, King Varuna knoweth it; he is there as the third.

"This earth, too, belongs to Varuna, the King, and this wide sky with its ends far apart. The two seas (sky and ocean) are Varuna's loins; he is also contained in the small drop of water. He who would flee far beyond the sky, even he would not escape Varuna the King. His spies proceed from heaven towards this world; with thousand eyes they overlook this earth.

"King Varuna sees all this, what is between heaven and earth and what is beyond. He has counted the twinklings of the eyes of men. As a player throws the dice, he rules all things.

"May thy destroying snares, cast sevenfold and threefold, entangle him who tells a lie; may they spare the truthful, O King!"

There is undoubtedly a striking resemblance between this hymn, taken from the Atharva Veda (Max Mueller, Chap. I, 41 f.), and the 139th Psalm, and yet how widely do they differ in spirit and tone! Let us repeat the latter:

1. O Lord, thou hast searched me and known me.
2. Thou knowest my down-sitting and mine up-rising.
Thou understandest my thoughts afar off.
3. Thou encompassest my path and my lying-down,
Thou art acquainted with all my ways.
4. For there is not a word on my tongue,
But lo, Thou, O Lord, knowest it altogether.
5. Thou hast beset me behind and before,
Thou hast laid thine hand upon me.
6. Such knowledge is too wonderful for me;
It is too high; I cannot grasp it.
7. Whither shall I go from thy spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?
8. If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there;
If I make my bed in the netherworld, behold, thou art there.
9. If I take the wings of the morning,
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea,
10. Even there shall thy hand lead me,
And thy right hand shall hold me.
11. If I say, surely the darkness shall cover me,
Even the night shall be light about me.
12. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee,
But night shineth as day; darkness and light are both alike to thee.
13. For thou didst create my innermost parts;
Thou didst weave me together in my mother's womb.
14. I will praise thee, for I am made very wonderfully;
Marvellous are thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well.

And the Psalm closes:

23. Search me, O God, and know my heart;
Try me and know my thoughts.
24. And see if there is any wicked way in me,
And lead me in the way everlasting.

The Hindoo god Varuna is certainly endowed with moral attributes of a high order. He watches the doings of man below. Still he is substantially the watchman of the gods set up in the sky, with eyes piercing the darkness. The God of the Psalm is the Spirit dwelling within, penetrating the soul and the world's deepest thoughts as their Fashioner and Ruler. Man has outgrown Varuna; he will never outgrow the God of the Psalms.

But there are other beautiful hymns addressed to Varuna which deserve mention:³

"Let us be blessed, Varuna, in thy service.
We remember thee and praise thee day by day,
Like the fires lit on the altar at the approach of dawn.
Take from me my sin like a fetter,
And we shall increase the spring of thy law, O Varuna!
Let not the thread be cut while I weave the song;
Let not the form of the workman break before the time.
Take from me this fear, O Varuna, have mercy on me, O righteous King!
Like a rope from a calf, remove me from my sin; for away from thee
I am not master even of the twinkling of an eye.
Do not strike us with weapons which hurt the evil-doer.
Let us not go where the light hath vanished. Scatter our enemies
that we may live!
We did, we do and shall in all future sing praises to thee, O Varuna,
the mighty; for on thee rest all laws immovably as on a rock.
Move far away from me all guilt, and may I not suffer for what others
have done. Grant us to live many mornings that have not yet
dawned."—(Rig. Veda II, 28.)

Certainly this is a beautiful morning hymn. And there are many of these addressed to Varuna which, by their fervor, remind us of the Psalms. So Rig. Veda VII, 28:

"Let me not yet enter into the house of clay, O Varuna,
Have mercy, almighty, have mercy!
If I go trembling like a cloud driven by the wind,
Have mercy, almighty, have mercy!
Through want of strength have I gone wrong;
Have mercy, almighty, have mercy!

Whenever we men commit an offence before the heavenly host, O
 Varuna;
 Whenever we break the law through thoughtlessness,
 Have mercy, almighty, have mercy!"

Oldenberg, one of the greatest authorities on Hindoo lore, thinks that the deep ethical character which distinguishes Varuna and Mithra from the Pantheon of the Aryan religion is due to Semitic influence. It is, therefore, of special interest to glance, in this connection, at the Psalms of Penitence which the ancient Babylonians produced. They are remarkable, indeed, for the spirit of contrition and the profound consciousness of sin which they express. I shall quote only a few lines from Sayce's Hibbert Lectures, where Zimmern's *Babylonische Busspsalmen* are rendered into English (1887, pp. 349-355 and 521-531):

"May the wrath of the gods be appeased!
 I am in trouble and hide myself. I dare not look up.
 To my god, the merciful, I utter my prayer!
 I kiss the feet of my goddess and wash them with tears.
 O God, how long shall thy wrath abide?
 Destroy not thy servant, take my hand when I bathe in the sea.¹
 Turn my sins into a blessing, let the wind carry off my transgressions.
 Strip off my manifold wickedness as a garment.
 O my God, seven times seven are my transgressions; forgive my sins!
 O my goddess, seven times seven are my transgressions; forgive my
 sins!
 Forgive my sins; may thy curse be removed.²

In another psalm he prays to the god and the goddess:

"May my sin be forgiven, may my transgression be cleansed!
 May the yoke be unbound, the chain be loosed!
 May the seven winds carry away my groaning!
 May the fish carry away my trouble, may the waters of the river
 cleanse me as they flow.
 Make me shine like a mask of gold, and appear bright as a vessel of
 glass.
 Cast off my evil, protect my life, bind together again my altar that
 I may set up thine image!
 Let me enter the palace of the gods, the temple of life!
 To Merodach the merciful, the Lord of happiness entrust me!
 Let me exalt thy greatness, let me magnify thy divinity!
 Let the men of my city honor thy mighty deeds!"

No one who reads this collection of Babylonian psalms can fail to notice that something of the religious passion

that burns in the soul of the Hebrew is also ablaze in those old kinsmen of Abraham. The bright and beautiful gods that fill Olympus with glee and laughter do not satisfy the longing of the Semite. The thought of guilt, the consciousness of wrong-doing, weighs heavily upon his mind; he must cleanse his heart by the fire of sacrifice and the water of ablution.

I shall not venture to discuss the question whether the priests of the Indus and Ganges borrowed these strains of penitential grief from those who lived on the shore of the Euphrates. It is sufficient for my purpose to point, by way of comparison, to the all-surpassing grandeur of the 51st Psalm of David, the great psalm of penitence for every remorse-stricken soul:

1. Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving-kindness;
According to the abundance of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.
2. Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity,
And cleanse me from my sin.
3. For I acknowledge my transgressions,
And my sin is ever before me.
4. Against thee only have I sinned and done evil in thy sight; so
that thou art justified in what thou decidest, and clear in thy judgment.
5. Behold, in iniquity was I brought forth
And in sin did my mother conceive me.
6. Behold, thou desirest truth in my inward parts
And in things hidden thou disclovest to me wisdom.
7. Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean,
Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow.
8. Make me hear joy and gladness,
That the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice.
9. Hide thy face from my sins,
And blot out all mine iniquities.
10. Create in me a clean heart, O God,
And renew a right spirit within me.
11. Cast me not away from thy presence,
And take not thy holy spirit from me.
12. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation
And uphold me with a willing spirit.
13. Then will I teach transgressors thy ways,
And sinners shall turn back unto thee.
14. Deliver me from deadly sin, O Lord, God of my salvation,
And my tongue shall sing aloud of thy righteousness.

15. O Lord, open thou my lips,
And my mouth shall tell thy praise.
16. For thou desirest not sacrifice, else I would give it,
Thou delightest not in burnt-offering.
17. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit;
A broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

The situation of the Hebrew psalmist is undoubtedly the same as that of the Babylonian. He, too, suffered intense physical pain (note the words: "Thou hast broken my bones!"), and was thereby reminded of his sinful state. He recognizes God's just dealing with him and, like the Babylonian penitent, he undergoes the priestly rite of ablution. In fact, the spirit of uncleanness cannot, in the ancient conception, yield to the spirit of holiness without the power of living water (Ezek. XXXVII, 25; Zechar. XII, 10-13; Isa. IV, 2-6). But the Hebrew psalmist realizes the need of purification from within. To him the rite becomes but a symbol of the spiritual renewal. Man born with animal passion must be regenerated, born anew to holiness in order to become one with God. The consuming fire of sacrifice of the Semite is transformed into the loftiest yearning of the human soul. As the rabbis say with reference to our psalms of King David, the very sin of the Psalmist becomes a stimulus for thousands of sinners to turn to righteousness.

MUSIC AND SONG OF THE SEMITE

In order to account for the depth and spirituality of the Psalms, some point to the deeper emotional nature, the more subjective or inward-bent character of the Semite as manifested in his speech, which is void of vowels, and in his poetry, which is lyric rather than epic or dramatic. There is similarity of form between Hebrew and every other Semitic song. Still, this explains as little the spirit of the psalms as the fierce fire of Moloch and the prophets of Baal explains the all-consuming fire of Jehovah which wipes out wrong and works for righteousness and holiness. The one is the chaff, the other the grain; the one the dross, the other the pure gold.

Before inquiring closer into the origin and spirit of the Psalms, I desire to present a question which, to my knowl-

edge, has never been considered in its true bearing on our subject. Why did music and song not find a place in the mode of worship mapped out with such detail in the Pentateuchal law? The books of Moses speak of their invention and use in the most ancient times by pastoral tribes. The shepherds of Haran show familiarity with them. At the Hebrew exodus Moses and Miriam sound the praise of God their Deliverer with timbrel and song. And when they dance around the golden calf at the foot of Mount Sinai, the people have music. In fact, no victory, no national or family festival is celebrated in the time of the Judges and Kings without the cheering strains of vocal and instrumental music. Prophet as well as patriot derive their inspiration from it. The victor returning from the battle-field is greeted with its joyous sounds, and fields and vineyards in harvest time echo its voice all over the land. Nay more. God himself, in the liberty song of Moses, is praised as נָאֵדָר בְּקֹדֶשׁ נֹרָא תְהִלּוֹת exalted in the sanctuary, awesome in hymns. How is it, then, that, with the exception of the trumpets and horns occasionally mentioned (Numbers X, 1-10), that powerful element of worship which alone lends solemnity and dignity, pathos and inspiration to the sacrificial form of worship, music, is totally ignored? This cannot be due to mere chance or neglect. This must be intentional. What can be the reason?

A glance at the character of Semitic music and song tells the whole story. There is hardly a musical instrument, a popular strain, or a mythical inventor of music known to the Greeks but proves at close examination to be of Semitic origin and type. Yet it all bears the impassioned, effeminating and voluptuous character of worship of wild nature. It is the outgrowth of the sensual cult of Adonis and Astarte whose cries הוּי דָד, הוּי אַח הוּי אָדוֹן ('Woe beloved! Woe brother! Woe master!') was heard in bewildering strains of alternating joy and grief as the song of Adonis, Bacchus, and Dionysius over the three continents. Especially in the land of Canaan did the wails and exultations over the separation and reunion of these gods and goddesses give rise to those abominations which stirred up the wrath of Israel's holy seers. In the shameful orgies in which, throughout the East,

women, as worshippers of the queen of heaven, were the chief singers and actors, the flute and the harp, the pipe and the cithara and similar instruments played no small role.³ One must consider this to fully understand the righteous indignation with which the prophet exclaims in the name of God: "Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs, for I will not hear the melody of thy viols." He detests the music and the chants of artists who, like David, invent for themselves instruments of music. He had seen the profanation of festal song by the assembling of fathers and sons to violate the virginity of women, and thus he prophesies that 'the songs of the temples shall be turned into howlings' (Amos V, 23; VI, 5; II, 7, and VIII, 3). Joy over heaven's gifts had led Israel, after the manner of heathen, to vice and shame. Therefore does the seer's voice grow so sad and his speech becomes an elegy. The Qinnah קינה the tune of lamentation, the cry of wailing and sighing אוי and הוי becomes the Leitmotif of prophecy.

There were traditions current concerning David's musical processions with the holy ark which seem to tell that they were not always chaste and decorous. (See II Samuel II, 7.) Nor can there be any doubt that dancing female singers once played a conspicuous part in the sanctuary of ancient Israel. (Compare Psalm LXVIII, 25—"the damsel's playing with timbrels"—with verse 11—"The women who bring glad tidings of a great war" and the procession of women in the sanctuary carrying mirrors (Exodus XXXVIII, 8, and I Samuel II, 22). Hence, the Hebrew lawgiver earnestly insisted on a chaste and serious mode of worship, and his preference for the sound of the horn and trumpet to the mellow and sensuous tunes of the flute and the cithara was but natural. Here, then, a new light is cast upon the history of the Psalms.

THE LEVITES

The Midrash, in commenting upon the 137th Psalm, tells a strange legend: King Nebuchadnezzar, having heard of the marvelous skill of the Levitical bards, said to those brought into captivity: "Sing for us one of the songs of

Zion!" but they, unwilling to profane their sacred art, in their despair, put their fingers into their mouth and bit off the tips so as not to be able to play on the stringed instruments, crying forth in deep woe: "How should we sing the song of the Lord on the soil of the stranger?" There is a profound truth expressed in this weird tale. Suffering and woe consecrated the Levite song to the service of God. Not the proud priest nor the female singer of the ancient sanctuary, but the sorely-tried captives of the Exile, the Levite, chastened by privation and anguish, chanted forth the Psalms as the new song of regenerated Israel. Through penitence and grief did the lyric song of the Semite attain its spiritual beauty and depth. It was first pointed out by Graetz that, owing to their impoverished and helpless condition—as dispossessed priests—the Levites formed a poor and humble class, a congregation of saints, the pious *Hasidim* and '*Anavim*, whose whole possession was their song. "I have none but God in heaven, yet I desire none besides Thee on earth" (Psalm LXXIII, 15) was their cry. Away from temple and sacrificial pomp, they yearned all the more 'for the living God,' and their souls soared on wings of devotion to the ethereal heights of mystic communion with Him. Their hope for immortality agrees neither with Persian nor with Egyptian views of the hereafter. They are one with the Rock of eternity, and thus death and the gates of the nether-world have lost their terrors for them. God is their refuge and help against the haughty princes and priests who oppressed them and heaped injury and contumely on them. These persecutions began already in pre-exilic times under King Manasseh and Amon, but the tragic fate of Judea lent a deeper pathos to their plaintive song. The Levitical *Hasidim* led the captive Jews in prayer and true devotion. The prophetic speech was bitter and biting; the Psalmist's strains offered comfort and cheer. They assured them that God was nigh to Jeshurun if he be *yeshar leb* ('upright in heart,'—Psalm LXXIII, 1). The house of sacrifice had fallen into ruin; the house of prayer, the Synagogue, rose under the melodious tunes of the Psalter.

DAVID'S AUTHORSHIP

In approaching the question whether David was the author of the Psalms or not, I wish first to state that I consider it a grave mistake on the part of recent Bible critics like Smend, Stade and Cheyne to ascribe all the psalms to late post-exilic writers, and reduce the kings and foes, the strifes and ills so bitterly complained of by the sacred singer, to mere shadows without substantial facts. They boldly assume that we have no psalm of the time previous to the Babylonian exile, and then assert, very often against the plain sense of the verse, that in speaking of his fears and anxieties, his enemies and persecutors, or of his hopes and his victories, either in the singular or in the plural, as I or WE, the Psalmist always represents typically the congregation or the nation with its troubles and its Messianic expectations. It seems to me that there is something radically wrong in this interpretation of the Psalms which deprives them of their natural vigor and originality. Tradition is right in finding a powerful individuality portrayed in those fervent appeals to God for help and those unique expressions of confident reliance upon the Rock of salvation. These words must have been coined by men who, like David, led the life of a fugitive in the desert and underwent great personal hardships. If not David, then some other ruler of his blood or stamp, some great personality, must have fought with bitter foes within and without, with woe and misery, or with sin and scathing remorse until his struggle and his triumph found words so striking and impressive as to make us all participants in the noble strife. Such figures as Jeremiah, or 'the man of sorrow' of the 53d chapter of Isaiah, or Job, are brought vividly before us when we hear their very ordeals, their complaints and their inner victories voiced in the Psalms. It is simply impossible that the 46th Psalm—Luther's "Eine feste Burg ist unser Gott!"—

"God is our refuge and strength, . . .

We will not fear though the earth be removed,

Through the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea,"—

or that the 18th Psalm, which many modern critics ascribe indeed to David, should have been written by one not kindled

with the spirit of heroism in the midst of a mighty battle with surrounding hosts. And thus do all the *King*-psalms point to a real king, and not to a mere fiction. It was, therefore, the most natural inference which offered itself to the collectors of the Psalms, to find in the checkered life of David the real background of all the sighs of anguish and the songs of victory presented therein. The fact is that we have a large number of psalms in which the singer personifies the nation, or the congregation, as was done already in the Song on the Red Sea: "I sing to the Lord;" in the so-called prayer of Hannah: "My heart rejoiceth in the Lord" (I Samuel II, 1), and in Isaiah (XII, 1): "O Lord I will praise thee." Others we have in large number, especially in the older collection, in which one cannot fail to feel the heart-pulse of the heroic warrior or martyr who describes his own experience.

Sight has been lost of one important feature. We must carefully distinguish between the original composition of the psalms and their remodeling for public service. The 18th Psalm is the best illustration of their two-fold character. The description of the battle, of the peril, and the appearance of God as the heavenly Warrior to aid the hero, proves it to be of ancient origin and supports the assumption that it is of Davidic authorship. On the other hand, there are passages interwoven which are altogether too gentle for the man of blood, and must be ascribed to those saintly singers, after Isaiah's time, who made 'humbleness' their divine ideal and aim. In this manner many of the psalms, even such as Psalm CXLIV, passing under the name of David, underwent alteration or modification when adapted to the new surroundings (to the Maccabean warrior age) and then admitted into the collection.

It may therefore be stated as a general rule that, whether written before or after the Exile, the older psalms were individual outpourings before they became temple hymns. A glance over modern as well as ancient poetry confirms, in fact, the principle that all great hymns were living truths before they were sung. All great poems were personal experiences before they became works of art. Genius, being

in touch with the eternal truth, always reflects a world's life in its own.

The rabbis say (Pesahim 117): David composed some of the psalms with reference to his own person (כנגד עצמו) and others he wrote on behalf of the Congregation of Israel (כנגד צבור אִמְרָן). Some he merely reproduced, while Adam, Abraham and Ethan, etc., were the real composers; or he anticipated Solomon and Ezra as the writers. The Greek and Syrian versions have in the headings also the names of Jeremiah, Haggai and Zechariah.

A large number were undoubtedly composed for immediate use in the temple or in the Synagogue of the Ḥasidim as supplications in times of war and peril, and as thanksgiving songs when victory had been achieved. Especially do the Asaph and Korahite psalms bear this character; also the Hallel psalms in the last book. Some, however, were written for public admonition and instruction on festal and fast days, whereas most of the Alphabetic psalms seem to be intended more for private meditations.

A great many psalms have a closing verse, or two, added for congregational response, which forms no part of the original composition.

COLLECTION OF THE PSALMS

The 150 Psalms in our present Masoretic text (for which the Rabbinical tradition assigns only 147) are divided into five books, corresponding with the five books of Moses. A doxology at the end of each book shows that the division must be an old one, although there is obviously no reason for this division. But there are sufficient proofs that the first 89 psalms formed an older collection, or set of collections, than the latter two books: 90th–150th. With the exception of the first two psalms, the whole first book has the name of David attached to each. The next two books contain the psalms ascribed to the singer guilds: to the sons of Korah, 42d to 49th, 84th and 85th, 87th and 88th, and to Asaph, the 50th, and 73d to 83d, and the 89th to Ethan, while the 51st to 71st bear again the name of David. The 72d is ascribed to Solomon. At the close the words occur:

"Here end the prayers of David the son of Jesse." We certainly have here three different collections. The first book belongs, in all probability, to the time of Zerubbabel and Ezra, when the need of a temple hymnal was first felt. The other collection of Davidic psalms and that of Asaph and Korahite psalms belong to the Persian age, or to the time when the Book of Chronicles was written, as is shown by the *headings*, the *musical terms* of which became unintelligible to the later generation of scribes.

None of the psalms in the last two books have musical headings, and only exceptionally the name of David is attached to them, and they are for the most part temple hymns of a cheerful strain, some in their present form pointing directly to the Maccabean victory. Still, while the collection was made in the Maccabean age, I am far from believing that such psalms as the Prayer of Moses (the 90th), or the Psalms of Ascent (שיר המעלות), and Psalm 144th are products of so late a time. I am rather inclined to believe that most of these psalms were recomposed to suit the new conditions, but, in fact, were composed in more ancient times. I find that the melodies of *Hodu*—"Thank the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy endureth forever!"—of Hoshannah and of Hallelu were known before the Exile. (See Jeremiah XXXIII, 11; XX, 13; XXXI, 2; Ezra III, 11.) Isaiah was familiar with the air: "Open the gates that the righteous may enter!" (Isa. XXVI, 2). Nehemiah heard the Levite song of the Hallel: אָנָּה יְיָ הַצְלִיחָה נָא (Nehemiah I, 11). Nay, AMEN! (אָמֵן), the KADOSH (קדוש) and the *Baruch* (ברוך) the *Kumah* (קומה יי) and *Shuba Adonai* (שבה יי) and the like, may easily be traced back to pre-exilic time, if not to the oldest days of the nation.

And still older than the words are probably the tunes. It has been observed that the old field processions with the song: אַל חַשָּׁה 'Destroy not!' (Isaiah LXV, 8) probably furnished the music for the psalms bearing that heading. And so did the strains: אַל חֲרוֹק ('Be not far, O Lord!') or חוּשָׁה לְעוֹרָתִי ('Haste to my aid!') live on in the memory of people long enough to furnish familiar old tunes to new texts for the sacred singers. These tunes are indicated in some of the headings of the psalms.

And this is a point overlooked in Jewish music. The words die, but the airs live and often produce new songs. In the *Kol Nidre* melody there lives, for aught we know, the music of centuries. Such was the case with the temple music. The festal joy and the plaintive cry were phonographed in the Psalm melodies and transplanted to synagogue and church.

An old Talmudical tradition (Sota 47b, Tosefta Sota) has the interesting record that under the victorious King John Hyrcanus the shrill and piercing sounds of alarm raised by musical instruments at the singing of the Psalm verse: עורה יי למה חישן ('Awaken, O Lord, why art thou asleep?') (Ps. XLIV, 24) were abrogated. Certainly not on account of the anthropomorphic expression about God which gave offence, but because the victorious age called for livelier and more cheerful strains. Still, the old plaintive note continued in the penitential songs and the fast day hymns. In times of famine and war, the Shophar blasts calling for repentance re-echoed the elegiac melodies, and in all likelihood we still hear them in our *Qinnot* and *Slihot* tunes.

On the other hand, I doubt not that the same cheerful strains of festal joy were preserved for centuries in the Hallel psalms. There is a striking family likeness between the Passover vigils of the Therapeutae, the Egyptian or Hellenized Essenes, and the Passover Haggadah with its Hallel in the Jewish home, and still more between the Therapeutic song of Moses and Miriam and the responses: כמורה and יי ימלך in the *Ge'ullah* of our morning prayer (originally Essene—Notice the שמחה רבה). And likewise the Hoshannah cries in our *Sukkot* and *Hoshannah Rabbah* service may be easily traced through synagogue and church, back to the temple and the Water procession song during the festal nights. Talmud and Midrash (cf. Pesahim 113b, Midrash Tehillim, Psalm 116th, and Mekilta Beshallah) preserved the tradition of choral and congregational singing and responsive recitation of certain Psalm verses under the leadership of Moses and Miriam with reference to the song on the Red Sea, or of the three friends of Daniel with reference to Hallel.

Our knowledge regarding the Temple music is certainly

very scanty. But it is not assuming too much to say that it was better developed than we are inclined to think. Recent discoveries of Greek notes used in the Apollonic hymns at Delphi betray a high art of musical composition. Of the Therapeutae in Egypt we are told that they had their male and female voices, their alto and soprano in their choir. It is, therefore, very likely that the psalm heading על עלמות and על השמינית referred to the major and minor key and the octave, as is stated in the instructive article on 'Music' in Riehm's *Bibl. Handlexicon* and Dr. J. Weiss's *Die Musicalischen Instrumente des alten Testaments*, Gratz, 1895.

THE PSALMS AS PRAYERS

The Psalms as prayers was the subject I was mainly to speak on. Did I digress from it too far? I think not. Song is older than prayer. It intones worship. It creates devotion. The multitude sing, the individual prays. Prayer wells up from the depth of the soul, and only single individuals find words for tears and cries. The first (or second) collection of Psalms of David bore the name of תפלות דוד בן ישי ('prayers, not songs'). A few psalms still bear the name of תפלה ('prayer'). It has been said that Jeremiah, the most tender-hearted of the prophets, first taught people how to pray. Surely before the Exile we hear little of individual prayer. Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah and the men in the Book of Chronicles give us examples of devotional worship in stirring, responsive strains, the choir singing psalms, the congregation responding with 'Amen!' The leader starts with ברכו ('Bless ye the Lord!') and the response follows: ברוך 'Blessed is He!').

While the Hallel and similar psalms were written for use in the Temple, there are others which seem to have been written for congregational worship in the Synagogue. There is no reference to Temple sacrifice in the 107th Psalm or in many that precede or follow it, where an allusion to the same might be expected. I do not agree with Graetz that the 134th Psalm—"Bless the Lord all ye worshippers of God who stand (in prayer) העומדים in the house of the Lord all night"—refers to the Sukkot night procession described in the Mishnah (*Sukkah* V, 2). The occasion was an out-

burst of joy, even for the *Hasidim*, not of serious prayer, as the word העומדים suggests. Graetz and others, while relying on a few Talmudical traditions concerning the use of the Psalms in the Temple, incline to ascribe a large number of these to a late Maccabean age, overlooking the important fact that many of these very psalms are opposed to sacrificial worship. Such are not only the 51st, which has its sharp anti-sacrificial edge smoothed over by two additional verses of a pro-sacrificial character, the 40th and 50th, which belong to the old pre-exilic age, but also the 141st Psalm, in which we read חֲכֹן חֲפִלְתִּי קֶטֶר לִפְנֵיךְ ('Let my prayer appear before thee as incense, and the lifting up of mine hands as the evening sacrifice!') Many of the *Hasidim* of the Psalms met under the roof of the Temple not for sacrificial worship but for prayer, and to such devotional night gatherings of the 'station men' the אנשי מעמד or the *Hasidim* in general, does the 134th Psalm refer. Not only the New Testament (Luke 2), but also the Midrash (Eka Rabba to III, גִּדְרָא בְעֵרִי) speaks of pious women joining such prayer meetings in the Temple precincts.

It was only in later times that a compromise was effected between the Chasidim who sang and prayed and who composed and recited psalms and prayers, and the priests who offered the sacrifice by means of the מעמדות—the institution of a representative body of laymen fasting and praying, while attending in body or in spirit the regular daily sacrifice. Originally they stood at opposite ends, the one body for the letter of the law, the other for the holy spirit of God, which moved them freely as it did the prophets of old. It is a late and unwarranted assumption that the prayers were instituted simply as a substitute for the morning and evening sacrifice חֲפִלָּה בַּמָּקוֹם קֶרֶבֶן. Daniel, the model Essene, or *Hasid*, and the Psalmist (Psalm LV, 18), as well as the usage of the Synagogue to this very day, point to a worship three times a day, such as the Parsee and Hindoo saints have: at daybreak, at noon or afternoon, and at sunset. It is not merely accidental that the first two psalms in the oldest collection, the 3d and 4th, are morning and evening psalms.

It is also quite important in this connection to notice that

on fast days, in times of great trouble for the people in Judea, the saints, the *Hasidim*, interceded with their powerful spell of prayer, and not the priests with their sacrifice. And the prayers introduced and instituted on this occasion are the same which the Synagogue reserved for its penitential and New Year's days. I refer to the מלכיות וזכרונות ושופרות (לרחמנא רחם עלן) the Kyrie Elyson (רחמנא רחם עלן), and מי שענה, also preserved in the oldest Church ritual and the Falasha liturgy.

Altogether the Psalms formed the necessary supplement of the Law with its ancient sacrificial system. They strike the deeper chords of devotion, and respond to the more spiritual needs of man. They created both the Synagogue and the Church.

PLACE OF THE PSALMS IN THE LITURGY

It is scarcely probable that the whole collection of Psalms was used for Temple songs; certainly not in later times. Some were not adapted for Temple songs; others were only made so by an additional congregational response at the end. But they may have originally served as hymns in the synagogue of the *Hasidim*. It does not necessarily follow that the headings, partly in the Massoretic text, and more fully preserved in the Septuagint, designating Psalms for the Sabbath, for the six week days, for the Dedication of the House, and similar ones, refer originally to the Temple. The Mishnah (Tamid VII) and the Talmud (Rosh Hashanah, 31a; see also R. Hanel in Bikkure Ha'ittim, Vol. XII, p. 51) lead us to surmise that the אנשי מעמד, the 'Station Men,' representing the people at the daily sacrifice, selected the week-day psalms with a view to the six days' creation and their own religious functions on these days.

The question of greatest importance is, Where did our liturgy originate? Those who, since Zunz, attempted to trace it exclusively to Temple practice, have failed to offer a satisfactory explanation of its origin. (See my article in Frankel's Monatschrift, 1893, 441ff, 489ff.) The morning and evening prayer at the rising and setting of the light of day, followed by one for the light of the Law surely is, as

Rappaport first suggested, an ancient Ḥasidim, or Essene, practice, prompted by the light worship of the Parsee, with the view of turning the soul from the splendor of the created light to the Creator. To greet the ruler of day as herald of God's glory with solemn praise, the Essenes or Watikim (the Virtuous Ones) stood in devotion watching for the breaking forth of its first rays (הניך החמה Berakot, 9b), whereas in the evening they prayed at the exact time of sunset (בדמדומי החמה Berakot, 29b).

How, then, did they prepare themselves for the solemn moment?

They recited psalms פסוקי דזמרא in responsive strains. Yoseh ben Ḥalafta, a follower of the old Essenes, expressed a wish no longer understood in the Talmud (Shabbat, 118b): יהא חלקי מגומרי הלל בכל יום ('May my lot be of those who finish the Hallel every day!') The Talmud refers this to the last five psalms which are recited daily in the Synagogue before the benediction over the light (יוצר אור). As if Rabbi Yose could not easily have followed this practice for himself! But he certainly knew of the one which only the elect carried out. There are Christian monks who have preserved the custom of these saints of old of reciting the Psalms every night. That some Essenes did so, may be learned from the fact that King David is represented in the Talmudical tradition as having chanted the praise of God from midnight till dawn. (See Berakot, 3b.) Perhaps in using the term Hallel for the Psalm-book R. Yose (see Blau. Zur Einleitung in die Heilige-Schrift, p. 36) had simply the fifth book in mind, which contains the Hallel psalms chiefly, and probably gave the Psalter the name of *Tehillim*. Our selections of Psalms, made according to I. Chronicles XVI, 8-36 (יהי כבוד) and certain psalms chosen for week, Sabbath and festal days (see Landshut's Notes in Edelman's Heginon Leb, and J. Mueller's Massechet Soferim XIV) are only a substitute for the reading of the whole Book of Psalms.

The best proof of the correctness of my view is that the founders of our liturgy have the reading of the Psalms in the morning prayer *introduced* by a *benediction*: ברוך שאתמר (Blessed be Thou, O Lord, who is exalted by the tongue of His

CHASIDIM and His servants [*Therapeutæ*], and by the songs of David, Thy servant' . . .), this being the benediction which *precedes* the reading of Hallel or Thillim (ברכה שלפניה), and *closed* with a *benediction*: ב.א.י. הבורח ישחבה ברכה שלאחריה: ('Blessed be the Lord, great in praises, who has found pleasure in the songs of the Psalter!' . . .) This latter, together with the sublime and ancient dithyrambic prayer, *Nishmat*, is called in the Mishnah (Pesahim, 117b f.) 'Benediction over the Psalm-book (ברכת השיר). Regarding its age, see Landshut, Beer and others. That the *Yishtabah* benediction corresponds exactly with the Yehallelucha benediction at the close of Hallel (in which the *Hasidim* are also specified as reciting the 'tenfold' form of Hallel) needs no special argument. The fact is certain that, exactly as the founders of our liturgy have a special form of benediction prescribed for the reading from the Law, and another for the reading from the prophets, both *preceding* and *following* the same, so they did for the reading of the Psalms. This throws some light on the benediction preceding the reading of the five Megillot.

But the doxology, which is recited in the morning after the selection from the Psalms, has also found a place at the close of the evening prayer. The . . . ברוך י"י לעולם אמן ואמן. The . . . ברוך י"י ביום ברוך י"י בלילה points to a similar recitation of Psalms in the evening, for which only a substitute seems to have been retained in our liturgy. Whether the five books of the Psalter were distributed by the Essene saints over three portions of the day and two of the night is uncertain. However, David's Psalter was to awaken the day for them from its slumber, and also to lead it to its close.

At noon there was at least one psalm to be recited, the 145th, for the threefold recitation of which on each day eternal bliss in the heavenly world of song is promised (Berakot 4b) כל האומר תהלה לדוד ב' פעמים בכל יום מובטח לו שהוא בן עולם הבא. Why just this one was selected, does not seem difficult to surmise. The verses, "The eyes of all wait upon thee, and thou givest them their food in due season. Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living being," contains the grace for each of the three meals, thus consecrating the bodily food to the service of God.

And so each season, each Sabbath and festival, had its special psalm in the temple, in the synagogue, and at the table. The treatise Massechet Soferim contains especially interesting records in this direction, and particular attention may be called to the New Moon banquet of the *Haberim* or Essene brotherhood. The Psalms, in these fragmentary records of the ancient Palestinian liturgy, play a most prominent part, and the congregational response, *Hodu*, to every sentence of the prayer corresponds strikingly with the Song of the Three Youths in the Apocryphical part of Daniel, also retained in the Church Liturgy and among the old *Falashah* prayers.

דברי קדושה קודמין לדברי קבלה ('Psalms lead and the prophets follow') is the rather surprising rule given in Treatise Soferim XVIII, 3. And it is, indeed, adhered to in the ancient New Year's Day Prayer of the Essenes (*Watikim*), the *Malkiot*, *Sikronot* and *Shoferot*, where the quotations of the Psalms, introduced with קדוש כתוב לאמר (as 'words of the Holy Spirit') *precede* the prophetic verses. The reason can only be found in the fact that the *Psalms formed the chief medium of praise* at the very outset.

Isidor Loew, in an essay on the 'Eighteen Benedictions,' has endeavored to prove the connection of these prayers with the Psalms. (See his *Literature des Pauvres*, Paris, 1892, p. 158f.) I think there is sufficient support for the general statement that each benediction ברוך אתה ה' is the response to some original verse of the Psalms (cf. Yer. Berakot I, 3d חותמי הברכות מעין הברכות). Thus, for instance, the benediction יוצר אור closed originally with the Psalm verse לעושה אורים גדולים כי לעולם חסדו (Psalm CXXXVI, 7). The benediction גאולה in the morning and evening, where the כנאומך points to some verse now omitted, had originally the last verse of Psalm XIX יהיו לרצון אמרי פי והגיון לבי (לפניך ה' צורי וגואלי). (See Baer, *Gebetbuch* 86 and 167). As to the קדושה, Joel Mueller (Mas. Soferim, p. 228) has shown that the verse from Isaiah V, 16 (ויגבה ה' צבאות במשפט והאל הקדוש נקדש בצדקה) was the general form which prompted the response האל הקדוש.

Some of the eighteen benedictions have been preserved in a more original form in the ancient Church Liturgy

(Apostolic Constitution VII, 33 ff.), and there the response "Blessed be Thou, Shield of Abraham" (מִן אֲבְרָהָם) is preceded by the words God said to Abraham: "Be a blessing." Also the benediction מְחִיָּה הַמָּתִים emphasizes the resurrection stronger while alluding to the oath which God swore to Adam, to which the Church fathers referred the verse from Psalm III, 6: "I laid myself down and slept; I awoke and God raiseth me," and which throws some light on the obscure עָפַר לִישְׁנֵי עָפַר ('He keepeth his faith with those who sleep in the dust'). (See Greenwald, *Der Einfluss der Psalmen auf die Katholische Liturgie*, p. 37.)

The head or apostle of the assembly, the שליח צבור, always closed his free outpouring of the spirit with a verse of the Psalms, and the assembly responded with בְּרוּךְ. Thus the early morning prayers מְחִיר בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה ה' מְלִבִּישׁ עֲרוּמִים and מְחִיר אֲסוּרִים were originally responses to verses from the 147th Psalm (ה' פִּקֹּחַ עֲרוּמִים, ה' מְחִיר אֲסוּרִים).

The rather odd benediction after the washing of hands (עַל נְשִׁילַת יָדַיִם), which the Talmud is at a loss to explain, originated in the recitation of the verse of Psalm CXXXIV, 2 (שָׁאוּ יְדֵיכֶם קֹדֶשׁ וּבִרְכוּ אֶת ה'), which is translated in the Targum: נִשְׁלוּ יְדֵיכֶם קֹדֶשׁ ('Lift up your hands to the holy place [on high]'). It was spoken during the ablution preparatory to prayer, or to the priestly benediction in which the ineffable name was originally pronounced. And so was, I think, the rather peculiar benediction over the bread (בִּאֲ"י הַמּוֹצִיא לֶחֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ), prompted by the verse of Psalm CIV, 13, "He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herbs for the service of man, that He may bring forth fruit out of the earth" (לְהוֹצִיא לֶחֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ).

Probably most of the benedictions over the enjoyment of some gift, or over some glad or sad tidings, had their origin in verses from the Psalms recited and responded to by the assembled brotherhood, which responses, in the course of time, became permanent formulas. Thus, for example, is our thanksgiving formula, recited in the synagogue after escape from peril, the בְּרַכַּת הַגּוֹמֵל, the summary of Psalm CVII. (See Berakot 54b and Midrash Tehillim.)

The benedictions before and after the reading from Scripture were also intoned by the repetition of verses from the

Psalms, parts of which are still retained in both the Synagogal and the Church Liturgy. (See Mas. Soferim XIV.)

The whole Prayer-book of the Karaites is almost an exclusive compilation of Psalms and other verses from Scripture. And so is the service of the penitential days, of fast and thanksgiving days, especially the *Selihot*, or that part which strikes a similar chord of penitential devotion in the week-day prayers in our ritual, and goes back to ancient times, the *יהוה רחום יכפר עון*, being chiefly based on verses of the Psalms.

THE PRAYERS OF THE FALASHAS

Especially interesting is the collection of prayers which Halevy brought from the black Abyssinian Jews, the Falashas, and which forms a connecting link between parts of the Church and the Synagogal Liturgy, undoubtedly belonging to a pre-Christian age. The Psalms, with their 'Amen' and *יהי שם יי מבורך לעולם* (the Kaddish in Hebrew!), the *Halleluyah* and *Kedushah* responses form the main part of the service.

Permit me to read the beautiful prayer the missionary Flat heard these semi-savage Jews recite as they sat down to their meal and rose again from the table:

He who presides at the table recites:

"Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, the God of Abraham, of Isaac and Jacob, the God of all men!"

The assembly responding: Amen!

"Praise and glory be to Him! All beings praise Him who giveth food to the hungry!"

Cong.: Amen!

"Bless us, as Thou didst Abraham!"

Cong.: Amen!

"Bless us as Thou didst bless the storehouse of Abidara!"

Cong.: Amen!

After meal:

"Blessed be God who hath gladdened us with food and drink!"

Cong.: Amen!

"Shield us from famine!"

Cong.: Amen!

"Shield us from thirst!"

Cong.: Amen!

"Clothe the naked! Feed the hungry!"

Cong.: Amen!

"Thou givest food to all flesh in due season and satisfiest all the living with favour! O Lord, grant to all who lift up their eyes to Thee whenever they need it—food, drink and raiment!"

Cong.: Amen!

"O merciful God, redeem Thy people, bless Thine inheritance!"

Cong.: Amen!

"Peace over Israel!"

Cong.: Amen!

Who can fail to recognize the spirit of the Essene brotherhood, with their legends of Abraham's and Sarah's blessings of hospitality echoed in these Abyssinian forms of prayer? An allusion to Abraham's blessing is retained in the Portuguese *הרחמן* at the close of the grace after meal!

THE PRAYERFUL TUNE OF THE PSALMS

The main idea transparent in all these prayers and praises is the spirit of the Psalms manifested in soul-stirring responses, in congregational song. Hymnal melody, choral singing, the harmony and symphony of souls united in prayer and thanksgiving, lent to the ritual of old its beauty and freshness. The earth should resound with the glory of God, as do the heavens above, where angels sing the praise of the Exalted and Holy One. Innocent children were, therefore, especially chosen to sing Psalms in old Palestine (see Midrash Tehillim, Psalm LXVIII, and elsewhere), and among the black Jews of Malabar, in India, the children were first instructed in the Psalms.

As a summary: The Psalter furnished at all times and in all climes spiritual help in danger and need for Jews and Christians alike. Psalms were sung in processions when people prayed for rain and for health, when the new baby lay in the cradle waiting for the initiation into the faith, and when the earthly pilgrim was brought to his last resting place.

The Psalms were also believed to be efficacious in spells of sickness and peril, and were used for amulets to charm the bearer against malign influences. (See about these Christian and Jewish practices, the instructive little work by Greenwald, quoted above.)

The 91st Psalm is called *שיר של פנעים* (Shabuot 15b). It was used as an incantation against evil powers, and so were entire books in circulation, giving directions how to use, or misuse, the Psalter for various occasions *שמוש חדלים*. But this is only the shadow which follows the light.

Certain it is that no book in literature fascinated the humblest and the highest in Judaism and Christendom as did the Psalter of David. In the striking combination of individual and national, of personal and communal, of sectarian and human sentiment, in the contrast of weakness and strength, of sin and saintliness, of human frailty and divine help, in the constant ebb and flow of joy and grief, of fear and hope, of trial and triumph presented in the Psalms there lies a secret which works wondrously on the human heart. All the hidden treasures of the deep seem to be brought to light by the storm that agitates, and the sunshine that calms, this river of God full of grace and of blessing. It was, it still is, the Christian's *Vade mecum*. In the past the Jew, too, felt its attractive and soothing power, but his partial love for the Law and the Talmud made him oblivious and regardless of this treasure. And the modern Jew has entirely unlearned to recite and chant, to read and appreciate the Psalms.

"King David had an Æolian harp hanging over his bed, and when the north wind blew, he heard the most melodious tunes rung forth from its strings by every breeze, and he rose in the middle of the night to sing the praise of God in strains which will never die." Thus the rabbis say. This Æolian harp we still possess, but our ears are too deaf to listen, our hearts too heavy to be roused from sleep to sing the glory of God. Let us again familiarize ourselves and our children, at home and in the house of God, with the words and the strains of the Psalms. Let us again read a psalm every morning and evening in loud, cheering and responsive notes. *עורה כבודי עורה הנבל וכנור* "Awake my glory, awake psaltery and harp; I will wake up the morning dawn"—the morning of the new day, when over the sensual shall triumph the spiritual, when over the sigh and sorrow of self-interest the Psalm verse will sound forth: "My strength and my song is the Lord!"

DIE BIBEL UND DIE TODESSTRAFE

EINE ZEITFRAGE VOM KRITISCH-HISTORISCHEN STANDPUNKTE BETRACHTET

„Das sind die Weisen,
Die durch Irrthum zur Wahrheit reisen;
Die auf dem Irrthum verharren,
Das sind die Narren.“

(Rückert)

VORWORT

DIE Bibel, jenes heilige Urkundenbuch, das die Quelle unserer Religion und Civilisation geworden ist, ist durch nichts so sehr als durch die Bestrebungen der verblendeten Vertreter der religiösen Interessen bei den gebildeteren Klassen in Verruf gekommen. Mit der Berufung auf ihren 'Schein,' auf die Autorität der Religion stellt sich die Geistlichkeit in ihrer überwiegend grossen Zahl dem gesammten sittlichen Bewusstsein der Zeit und ihren reformatorischen Bedürfnissen hemmend gegenüber. Kein Wunder, dass die Bibel überall als Hemmschuh alles und jeden Fortschrittes, als Aushängeschild aller reactionären Bestrebungen auf der einen Seite ebenso gering geschätzt, wie auf der anderen als unantastbar heilig und vollkommen gehalten wird. Welches Recht oder Unrecht hat man nicht schon mit der Bibel vertheidigt! Mit dem Buchstaben der Bibel hat man in unsrer Zeit die Sklaverei und den Menschenhandel aufrecht zu erhalten gestrebt; mit dem Buchstaben der Bibel hat man in der jüngsten Zeit zuerst in Süddeutschland und zuletzt in Sachsen die Todesstrafe als Gottlosigkeit gebrandmarkt, und jetzt, da in Preussens Regierung der Zug nach Bessergestaltung des Justizwesens auf moderneren Grundlagen sich endlich geltend machen will, schleudert das bekannte Organ Hengstenbergs noch den Bannstrahl auf 'die schmäbliche Verletzung des Wortes Gottes durch die Abschaffung der Todesstrafe in Sachsen.'

Wir zweifeln durchaus nicht daran, dass trotz der Bemühungen dieses nur noch zu einflussreichen evangelischen Pfaffenjunkersystems unsere Zeit die Todesstrafe im Namen der Menschlichkeit, im Namen der Sittlichkeit als eine Verletzung der Gottesebenbildlichkeit im Mörder verwerfen und die Sühne des verletzten Rechtsbewusstseins in der Wiederherstellung des verletzten Gottesebenbildes im Mörder, nicht in der Hinopferung eines neuen Gliedes der menschlichen Gesellschaft erblicken wird.

Aber wir wollen durch beifolgende Arbeit den Beweis liefern, dass der religiös-fortschrittliche Geist der biblischen Gesetzgebung nach ihren verschiedenen Entwicklungsphasen selbst sichtbar dahin strebt, die Todesstrafe aufzuheben und durch bessere Institutionen zu ersetzen. Wir wollen die Bibel heilig halten nicht als das unverbesserliche Wort Gottes aus einer Zeit, sondern als den Ausdruck des religiösen Bewusstseins durch eine mehrtausendjährige Entwicklung. Nur der Geist Gottes, der über den Buchstaben des Gesetzes steht, bleibt, belebt und lebt fort, der Buchstabe ist todt und tödtet.

Leipzig, den 1. September 1868.

Der Verfasser.

Nachbemerkung

Wir haben die freudige Genugthuung, noch kurz vor der Veröffentlichung dieses Schriftchens auf den Artikel: Blutrache von Prof. Nöldeke in dem soeben erschienenen 6. Heft des Schenkel'schen Bibellexicons verweisen zu können, mit dessen gediegenen Ansichten, wie wir sie bei dem gründlichen Kenner des Morgenlandes gewohnt sind, wir uns in erfreulicher Uebereinstimmung befinden.

WER kennt nicht aus der griechischen Sagenwelt die kindlich schöne Erzählung: Die eifersüchtigen Götter wollten den Menschen das Feuer vorenthalten, aber der schlaue Prometheus raubte es den Olympiern und brachte es 'im markigen Rohr verborgen' den Irdischen; so erlernten sie den Gebrauch des Feuers, den Betrieb der Künste. Aehnlich lautet auch die biblische Sage: Die Gottheit wollte

nicht, dass der Mensch vom Baume der Erkenntniss, dessen Frucht nur der Gottheit allein zustehe, geniessen sollte. Er that es doch und—seine Augen wurden helle, aber damit er nicht gleichen Ranges sei mit den Himmlischen, verschloss ihm die Gottheit den Weg zum Baume des ewigen Lebens. So musste der Mensch auch das geistige Bewusstsein, 'das Wissen um das Gute und Böse' der Gottheit abtrotzen.—Ein tiefer Sinn liegt in diesem allgemeinen Zug der alten Völkersagen. Jeden Schritt, den die Menschheit auf dem Wege der Civilisation vorwärts that, musste sie der Gottheit oder dem religiösen Prinzip, in dem sie befangen war, abtrotzen und abringen. Die Religion war es, die ehemals alles Denken und Wissen und Schaffen des Menschen umspannte. Die Begriffe von Kunst und Wissenschaft, von Stern- und Naturkunde, von Gesundheits- und Rechtspflege, von Philosophie und Literatur haben sich allesamt aus der einen Totalität der Religionsanschauungen herausentwickelt. Und dieser Entwicklungsprocess der Menschheit zur Freiheit, zur Selbständigkeit, zur Gottähnlichkeit vollzog sich zu allen Zeiten und unter allen Zonen unter schwerem Kampf, vergleichbar nur jenem nächtlichen Ringkampf, in dem der Held in der Sage mit der unbekannten Gottheit sich misst, um mit höheren Begriffen und Namen, mit höheren Eigenschaften aus dem Kampf hervorzugehen, in dem neugewonnenen höheren sittlichen Bewusstsein die höhere Gottesidee abspiegelnd.

Ein solches geistiges Wachsthum der Menschheit, eine solche geschichtlich fortschreitende Entwicklung der Cultur und Civilisation vollzieht sich in unausgesetzter Weise und in immer ausgedehnteren Kreisen seit fast 3000 Jahren auf Grundlage der durch israelitisch-jüdische Gottesmänner offenbarten Wahrheiten, auf Grund einer heiligen Literatur, die wir schlechthin das Buch der Bücher, die Bibel zu nennen uns gewöhnt haben. An ihr ist nicht bloss eine jüdische, eine christliche und mohamedanische Weltreligion zur Reife gekommen, auch die romanische und deutsche Cultur, die moderne Civilisation hat ihre Wurzeln und Keime auf dem engen und trockenen Boden der mittelalterlich-biblischen Religionsanschauungen, aus dem sie mit immer klarerem und universellerem geschichtlichen Bewusstsein sich heraus-

zuarbeiten hatte und, sagen wir noch heute, herauszuarbeiten hat.

Es ist darum nicht bloss ein wissenschaftliches, sondern weit mehr noch ein tief innerst religiöses Interesse, das uns treibt, uns mit den Anschauungen der Bibel abzufinden und das Verhältniss dessen, was uns noch heute an das alte heilige Schriftenthum knüpft, und dessen, was uns von ihm scheidet, klar auseinanderzusetzen, um gerade die Ueberzeugung zu gewinnen, dass wir heute nur mit geschichtlichem Selbstbewusstsein das fortentwickeln, was ehemals der Menscheng Geist sich selber unbewusst als das Höhere, Göttliche aus sich heraus gestaltet und fortgebildet hat. Alles, was den Menschen als das Göttliche sich offenbart hat, muss daher, soll es für unsere heutigen Lebensfragen zu Rathe gezogen werden, geschichtlich, das heisst in feinem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange begriffen und geschichtlich, das heisst für die zeitliche Aufgabe oder den geschichtlichen Zweck gewürdigt werden.

I

Wie steht es nun mit den biblischen Weltanschauungen überhaupt? Können sie für unsere moderne Bildung massgebend sein? Zwischen der naiven Naturanschauung der Bibel,—in der die Lichtkörper am Himmel wie an einer Glasglocke hängen, um die durch Säulen über den Wassern befestigte Erdscheibe zu beleuchten und den Menschen und Völkern 'Zeichen' ihrer Geschehnisse zu sein,—und der modernen Naturwissenschaft gähnt eine so weite Kluft, dass es nur noch dem höheren Blödsinn oder dem dummsten Uebermuth eines Pfaffen-Junkerthums beikommen kann, die biblischen Anschauungsformen zur 'ewigen' Norm aufzustellen. Es wird gewiss auch kein Vernünftiger auf den Einfall gerathen, die Sprachwissenschaft nach der biblischen Mythenform, dass die Sprachverschiedenheit der Menschen aus einer allgemeinen Sprachverwirrung entstanden sei, umzumodeln. Steht nun die gesammte sinnliche Weltanschauung der Bibel auf einer so kindlichen Stufe, wie eben das ganze Alterthum, so ergibt sich für die sittlichen und

rechtlichen Begriffe und Anschauungen der Bibel consequentermassen der Schluss, dass auch sie, berechnet für ein Volk auf primitiver oder doch mindestens nicht hoher Bildungsstufe, eben nur Maass und Ausdruck der Zeit sein können, der sie ihrem Ursprunge nach angehören. Nur Eines darf man hier nicht, wie es Seitens der Nationalisten leider so gut wie Seitens der Buchstabengläubigen geschieht, in Erwägung zu ziehen unterlassen, dass von dem Gesetz, das die rauhe und niedrige Realität des Lebens der Volksmasse im Anschluss an das fortwuchernde und nach und nach erst zu überwindende Alte regelnd umgestalten soll, die höhere, treibende Idee sich weit abhebt als das, künftige bessere Zeitgestaltungen vorbereitende Ideal der auf der Zeiten-Warte stehenden Gottesmänner, Propheten und Menschheitsapostel. Dieser eine Unterlassungsfehler hat aber seine Quelle in dem noch viel ärgeren Grundirrtum, dass man Alles, was ein 1000 jähriges Schriftenthum gezeitigt und was eine mehr als 3000 Jahre alte Kulturentwicklung aus ihren verschiedenen Epochen schichtenweise über- und nebeneinander gelagert hat, unter dem einen Worte: Die Bibel oder Altes und Neues Testament, in 2 grosse Gegensätze zusammenfasst und Zeit- und Staatsverhältnisse, Volkssitte und Individualität des Schriftstellers, ältere und jüngere Gesetzessammlungen, Berichte und Urtheile, natürliche und künstliche Auslegungen, ohne jeden geschichtlichen Maassstab und ohne jedes kritische Urtheil, bunt durcheinander wirft. Damit gerade hat man sich die Einsicht in den Fortschritt der religiössittlichen Ideen in der Bibel versperrt und die Augen der einzig grossen Lehre, die uns heute die Bibel noch bringen soll, dass der geistige Fortschritt des Menscheinges auf dem sittlichen, d. h. religiösen beruht, verschlossen. Nur in Ermangelung einer geschichtlichen Erkenntniss dieser That-sache konnte der grosse Rechenmeister der Civilisation Buckle (Gesch d. Civilisation in England, S. 153.) die fast empörende Behauptung aufstellen, die sittliche Richtung und Anschauung der Menschheit bleibe sich immer gleich, es gebe nur einen intellektuellen, aber keinen moralischen

Fortschritt. Man lerne nur erst die heiligen oder nicht heiligen Schriften des Alterthums kritisch-historisch sichten und begreifen, und jenes Wahngelbde einer ewigen Gleichheit der Menschen schwindet ganz und gar. Schon die Form und die kindliche Motivirung allgemein geltender Sittengesetze beweist dies. Z. B. Ehre Vater und Mutter—damit Du lange lebst (Exod. XX, 12). Bedrückt Witwe und Waise nicht—sonst schreien sie zu mir und ich werde, darüber erzürnt, Euch umbringen und Eure Frauen zu Witwen machen und Eure Kinder zur Waisen (XXII, 21f)—Stehe auf vor dem Angesicht des grauen Hauptes—und fürchte Dich vor Deinem Gott (Levit. XIX, 32).—So müssen Rechts- und Sittenbegriffe einer Kindesnatur beigebracht werden.

Nehmen wir aber einmal den uns ganz geläufigen Satz: "Liebe Deinen Nächsten wie Dich selbst" (Levit. XIX, 18), so können wir ihn zwar mit dem Vollgehalt unseres Humanitätsgefühls erfüllen; unserem ganzen Ideal von Menschenliebe mag der Satz zum Ausdruck dienen. Geschichtlich und im Zusammenhang mit den anderen Gesetzesvorschriften betrachtet, hat er nur die enge Beziehung auf die 'Volksangehörigen,' von denen im selbigen Satze die Rede ist. Das mag uns fröstig klingen, aber gerade so war die Lehre wirksam und der Zeit angemessen. Auf die Allgemeinheit der Menschen bezogen, wäre das Gebot der Liebe nimmermehr beherzigt oder vom Volke nur verstanden worden, wie ja in der That das grosse Wort der 'Liebe' im Munde des edlen Stifters der christlichen Religion durch die ganze Geschichte der katholischen und orthodoxen Christenheit zur leeren Phrase, zum Deckmantel des grausamsten Menschenhasses geworden ist. Dadurch, dass die Idee der Menschenverbrüderung und Menschenliebe sich erst im engen Kreise der Nation verwirklichen konnte, dass, als die religiöse Gemeinschaft die Grenzen des Landes und der Nationalität überschritt, die Bruderliebe sich in der religiösen Zusammengehörigkeit, in den Gemüthern der Glaubensbrüder befestigte, dadurch erstarkte allmählich das Pflichtgefühl, und der sittliche Begriff der Menschenliebe fand Raum sich zu verallgemeinern.—Die religiösen Wahrheiten, die dem einen, sei es Volks- oder Menschenindividuum, gegeben

wird,—warum sollen sie dem anderen ganz vorenthalten bleiben?—Der Gedanke, dass der Mensch schlechthin 'im Ebenbilde Gottes geschaffen sei,' dass 'Allen ein Vater ist, Alle ein Gott geschaffen,' drängte sich in der Anschauung der grossen Reformatoren der Menschheit, eines Hillel, eines Jesus, eines Paulus in den Vordergrund und bildete für neue Schöpfungen den Keimpunkt, deren Knospen und Blüthen nach langer schwerer Entwicklung und tiefer Einwurzelung der modernen Civilisation anheimgefallen sind, deren Früchte aber erst die geeinte ganze Menschheit reifen lassen und geniessen wird.

Das ist der ideelle Zusammenhang, der zwischen der alten und modernen Kultur besteht, und nur nach diesem geschichtlichen Verhältniss können und dürfen die althehrwürdigen Quellen einer langen Cultur für die Fragen der Gegenwart zu Rathe gezogen werden.

Ehe wir aber zu unserem eigentlichen Thema übergehen, wollen wir zur Beleuchtung unserer Grundsätze die Aufmerksamkeit des Lesers auf zwei Institutionen lenken, die mit unserem sittlichen Bewusstsein in schnödem Widerspruch stehen und für deren Aufrechterhaltung oder Begründung man sich in unserer Zeit auf die Autorität der Bibel berufen hat—die Sklaverei und die Vielweiberei. Es ist wahr, beide sind in der Bibel als zu Recht bestehende Institutionen anerkannt, aber wie verfährt der religiös-fortschrittliche Geist der Bibel mit ihnen? Verbieten konnte das Gesetz beide nicht in einem Staat, der mit vielen sclavenhändlerischen Staaten in naher Beziehung stand, und zu einer Zeit, wo jeder Kriegsgefangene an und für sich Slave und Slav, das heisst unbedingter Willensergebener des einzelnen Herrn war und wo Frauen wie Slaven nur Güter, die man erkaufte, Rechtsobjecte, nicht Personen waren. Prüfen wir aber die älteren und jüngeren Gesetzessammlungen, die unter dem Namen des Moses uns zugekommen sind, so sehen wir, was die Sklaverei betrifft, das Prinzip der persönlichen Achtung und Werthhaltung des Slaven mehr und mehr zum Durchbruch kommen, natürlich nicht sogleich allgemein, sondern in wirksamerer engerer Form, im Bereiche des Hebräerthums. Der hebräische Slave, der aus Noth oder in Folge eines criminalen Rechtsbruches seines

persönlichen Rechts sich begeben hat, ist nicht ewig Knecht; er soll im Brachjahre, im 7. (Exod. XXI, 2), oder doch nach dem der Praxis näherstehenden Gesetz (Levit. XXXV, 40) im 50., im Jubeljahre frei ausgehen. Man darf ihn nicht mit Härte behandeln—er ist Knecht Gottes (XXV, 55). Das deuteronomische Gesetz stellt für Slaven beiderlei Geschlechts das 7. Jahr als Norm für die Entlassung auf und verlangt, dass der Herr ihnen selber die Mittel an die Hand gebe, sich selbstständig zu machen, sie mit Gütern beschenke (Deut. XV, 4). Die Magd, die er einmal 'seiner Willkür unterworfen hat,' bleibt seine oder wird seines Sohnes Ehegenossin für immer oder—sie ist frei (Exod. XXI, 7–11). Für Todschlag seines Slaven wird er 'gerächt' und jede Verstümmelung macht auch den nicht hebräischen Slaven frei (Das. VII, 27).—Und von welchem humanem Geiste ist das Gesetz dictirt (Deut. XXI, 13), die kriegsgefangene Slavinn müsse erst Vater und Mutter einen Monat beweinen, ehe der Eigenthümer sie zur Ehegenossin nehmen darf! Nur erfüllt von dem Geiste, der über diesen Gesetzen und über den niederen Volksanschauungen als belebender Hauch edler Humanität schwebt, konnte der grosse israelitische Dichter etwa nach dem Untergange des Zehn-Stämmereichs den Hiob sprechen lassen:

Ob ich je das Recht meines Knechtes verachtet habe
Oder meiner Magd, da sie stritten mit mir?

Was that' ich auch, wollte Gott sich erheben?

Und wollt' er ahnden, was erwiderte ich ihm?

Hat nicht im Mutterleibe, der mich gebildet, auch
ihn gebildet?

Uns nicht im Mutterschooss Einer bereitet?—

Hiob XXXI, 13–15.

Nicht minder als das das menschliche Gefühl verletzende Slavenwesen ist dem höheren prophetischen Ideal auch die das sittliche Prinzip der Ehe verletzende Vielweiberei zuwider, trotz seines rechtlichen Bestands. Es ist gewiss kein Zufall, sondern klare Absichtlichkeit, dass die prophetischen Erzähler uns überall, wo von mehreren Frauen die Rede ist, in der Geschichte des Abraham, des Jakob und des Elkana, des Vaters Samuels, das Bild des häuslichen Zwiespaltes und der Eifersucht grell vor Augen führen und

das Vorhandensein mehrerer Weiber durch die Umstände der Kinderlosigkeit und dergl. meist zu rechtfertigen suchen. Sogar das Gesetz, das die Vielweiberei im Deuteronomium (XXI, 15) noch zu Recht anerkennt, lässt die Absicht durchblicken, vor den traurigen Folgen ehelicher Zerwürfnisse und Zerfahrenheiten zwischen der 'geliebten' und 'gehassten' Frau zu warnen. Wer nur das schöne idyllische Epos von der Brautwerbung und Heimführung Rebeka's (Genesis Cap. XXIV) mit Sinn und Gefühl zu lesen versteht, wer darauf achtet, wie die edlen Tugenden des Mädchens für die Wahl Eliesers entscheidend sind, wie die letzte Einwilligung des Weibes den Schein eines orientalischen Kaufes zurückdrängt und wie endlich dem um seine verlorene Mutter 'Klagelieder anstimmenden' Isaak die Gattin zugeführt wird, die er 'in seiner Mutter Zelt einführt, um in ihrer Liebe Trost zu finden für seine Mutter'—der wird in dieser Sagendarstellung eine volle Anerkennung des sittlichen Prinzips der Ehe und des edlen Berufes des Weibes finden. Unzweideutig lehrt schon jener schöne naive Mythos von der Erschaffung des Weibes aus des Mannes Rippe, dass nur die eine Frau die Sehnsucht des Mannes nach einem Lebensgenossen und Beistand befriedigen und nur im höheren sittlichen Sinne als ebenbürtiges Mitgeschöpf, als Mensch seines Gleichen, als 'Fleisch von seinem Fleische und Gebein von seinem Gebein' befriedigen kann, dass nur die eine Frau es ist, mit der er zu einem Fleische wird, mit der er für das zu verlassende Elternhaus ein neues Haus und eine neue Familie gründen soll. Hier findet sich wahrlich für den Gedanken einer Vielweiberei gerade so wenig Raum als in dem Geiste des letzten der Propheten Juda's, (Maleachi II, 13-16) der die Opfer schmäht, "weil der Altar von Thränen bedeckt ist von dem verstossenen Jugendweibe, das einen Bund mit dem Manne vor Gott eingegangen ist und nun von einer Fremden verdrängt wird."—

Wir sehen eben allenthalben in den Boden der alten Welt schon sittliche Ideenkeime ausgestreut und eingesenkt, die im Fortgange der jüdisch-christlichen Weltkultur jene sittlichen und rechtlichen Begriffe gezeitigt haben, die sich unsrem modernen Bewusstsein mit gewissem Recht als entschieden scharfe Gegensätze gegenüber den alten An-

schauungen darstellen. Und in diesem Sinne wollen auch wir es nunmehr versuchen, den geschichtlichen Beweis dafür zu liefern, dass der religiös-fortschrittliche Geist der Bibel selbst dazu drängt, die von der Bibel anerkannte und geforderte Todesstrafe aufzuheben und den Verbrecher zu einem besseren Leben und nicht zum Tode zu führen.

II

Um die Zwecke und Ziele der mosaischen Institutionen, das will sagen der sinaitischen, der israelitischen und jüdischen Gesetzes- und Kulturepochen und die späteren, des staatlichen Charakters entkleideten religiösen Bestrebungen auseinanderzuhalten und insbesondere jene zu verstehen und zu würdigen, müssen wir die Anschauungen und Gebräuche des Volkes, von denen die Gesetzgebung, soll sie anders wirksam und nicht utopisch sein, ausgehen muss, näher kennen lernen. Was aber dem Volksgeiste wirklich entspricht und als dessen Natur ihm so eigen ist, dass es durch lange und geduldige Arbeit idealer Kräfte immer noch schwer überwunden werden kann, das kann keineswegs die ausschliessliche Eigenthümlichkeit des einen Volkes sein, das muss in höherem oder geringerem Grade bei den verwandten Volksstämmen sich wiederfinden, die durch Abstammung, durch Verwandtschaft der Sprache und der religiösen Vorstellungen sich zu einer Völkerfamilie oder Sippe zusammenschliessen. So finden wir denn am Anfang aller Kultur bei den Hebräern wie bei ihren Stammgenossen, besonders den Arabern, und bei den wilden Beduinen noch heute eine tief in das Privat- und politische Leben eingreifende Sitte, die, von religiösen Anschauungen geheiligt, grausam gegen das eigene Fleisch und Blut wüthete und Familien und Stämme wie eine verheerende Pest aufrieb,— die Blutrache. Das verspritzte unschuldige Blut des Bruders oder nächsten Verwandten an dem Mörder und seiner Familie zu rächen, war eine heilige Pflicht, und das Blut des Erschlagenen schrie so lange zum Himmel, bis es gerächt war. Nimmer bedeckt vom Thau des Himmels und

nimmer verschlungen von der Erde, mahnte es die Menschen und Götter zur Rache.¹ Das ist die den semitischen Völkern gemeinsame Vorstellung; sie ersetzte den Mangel eines persönlichen Schutzes in den unvollkommenen staatlichen Einrichtungen und bei der Zerfahrenheit der einzelnen Stämme. Wir treffen sie deshalb auch bei den indogermanischen Völkern, bei den Griechen wie bei den Deutschen und Slaven² so lange in Schwung, als der Staat noch nicht die innere Kraft und Consolidation besass, um allen seinen Bürgern Schutz und Recht in allgemein befriedigender Weise zu bieten, so lange noch Selbsthilfe geboten ist. Daher hat die Einforderung des der Familie entrissenen Lebens immer den privatrechtlichen Charakter. Die Familie forderte durch den nächsten Verwandten eine Genugthuung und lässt sich je nach dem Werth und Ansehen des Gemordeten oder nach der Macht des eigenen Stammes, kurz nach ihrer Willkür mit so und so vielen Opfern an Menschenleben oder an Hausthieren entschädigen,³ wie das noch heute im Morgenlande üblich ist. So hallen auch die Lieder der Beduinenaraber, die Hamasen oder Tapferkeitsliedersammlungen von jenem unersättlichen Gefühl der Blutrache wieder. Ein solches echtes Beduinenlied aus althebräischer Zeit hat uns die Bibel selbst aufbewahrt und es in die möglichst älteste Zeit der Kultur hinausgerückt (Genes. IV, 23). Im Vollgefühl seiner Stärke und seiner Unangreifbarkeit spricht der gewaltige Lemech zu seinen Weibern:

Aba und Zilla, höret meine Stimme,
 Frauen Lemech's, neigt Euer Ohr meiner Rede;
 Wahrlich den Mann brächt' ich um für eine Wunde
 Und das Kind für eine Beule, mir beigebracht;
 Denn sollte Kain siebenmal gerächt werden,
 So soll's Lemech siebenundsiebenzig Mal.

Und Kain, der nach dem Brudermord der Blutrache sich verfallen glaubt, sichert Gott, um ihn unverletzlich zu machen, eine siebenfache Rache zu. (Genes. IV, 15). So sehen wir in jenen Zeiten rohen Ungestüms ganze Familien von dem Racheeifer mitbetroffen werden, und Kämpfe auf Leben und Tod zerfleischen ganze Stämme. Von solchen nimmersatten Blutfehden ist nicht blos die alte

arabische Geschichte voll—wir wollen von den Germanen nicht sprechen—, auch die israelitische Geschichte liefert uns viele traurige Spuren solcher Metzeleien ganzer Stämme oder Städte, die ob des Verbrechens eines Einzelnen insgesamt in die Acht erklärt werden. In Folge der blutigen Verletzung des Gastrechts in der benjaminitischen Stadt Gibeä wird 'der ganze Stamm von Israel gefäult' und auf göttliches Geheiss, wie uns der ausführliche Bericht (Richter XIX–XX) darüber Kunde gibt, fast dem Aussterben nahe gebracht. Wohl bereute man später jene entsetzliche That, allein 'Jahveh (Jehova) hatte diesen Riss in die Stämme Israels selbst gemacht.' Er hat durch den Ahroniden Pinehas und das heilige Orakel zu Mizpah die Aufforderung zum Vernichtungskriege gegeben. Und diese klaffende Wunde im Herzen der Nation fand ihre Heilung durch eben so erschreckende religiöse Kuren, wie der Kampf selbst. Den Grossen, 12,000 Mann starken Stamm der Gileaditen in Jabes haute man nieder, weil er dem eidlichen Aufgebot zum Heeresbann nicht Folge geleistet hatte, und mit den hierbei verschont gebliebenen 400 Jungfrauen gab man dem Rest der Benjaminiten Frauen zur Begründung neuer Familien. "Das war freilich die Zeit"—so schliesst der Bericht, "wo kein König war in Israel, wo Jeder, was ihm gut dünkte, that." Das war, fügen wir hinzu, die Zeit, wo die religiösen Vorstellungen noch roh genug waren, um einen Richter in Israel (Jephtah) noch in der religiösen Verblendung gefangen zu halten, dass er sein einziges Kind der Gottheit zum Opfer bringen müsse, weil er 'durch seines Mundes Ausspruch' eidlich gebunden sei. (Richt. XI, 35). Das war die Zeit, wo man in Israel heilige Kreuzzüge führte und über Menschen und Thiere und sämmtliche Beute den heiligen Bann aussprach und der Gottheit zur Ehre Alles verbrannte und niedermachte; wo man durch göttlichen Ausspruch entschied, wer sich durch Vergreifung an der eroberten Beute des Bannes schuldig, 'zum heiligen Bann gemacht' hatte, um ihn mit seiner ganzen Familie mit Hab und Gut zur Ehre Gottes zu verbrennen (Jos. VI und VII); die Zeit, wo man alles Männliche im feindlichen Lager sammt den Weibern auf göttliches Geheiss erschlug und von den verschonten Jungfrauen und anderen Gütern den 50ten

Theil als Tribut der Gottheit darbrachte. (Numer. Cap. XXXI). Was that man nun im Namen Gottes mit diesem Menschentribut? Das zu Besserem schon fortgeschrittene religiöse Bewusstsein hatte—in dem vorbildlichen Erzvater Abraham—den Gottesdienst durch Menschenopfer abgeschafft; zum Ersatze dafür wurden die verschonten Feinde der Gottheit zum niederen Tempeldienst, zum Holzhauen und Wasserschöpfen u. dgl. hingegeben. Daher entstand eine Klasse von Netinim—'Gotthingegebenen,' Tempelsclaven.⁴ Dazu gehört der ganze Stamm der durch List dem Kriegsbanne entgangenen Gibeoniten. (Jos. Cap. XI).

Sehen wir aber, wie tief solche religiöse Anschauungen wurzeln und noch lange im Herzen des Volkes fortwuchern. Noch zur Davidischen Zeit verlangt das religiöse Gefühl, aufgestachelt durch die langjährige Hungersnoth, solche heilige Gottessühne an dem Hause Saul's, weil dieser 'im Eifer für die (Reinhaltung der Geschlechter der) Söhne Juda's und Israels' jene zum Tempelsclavendienst mit dem Bundeseid geweihten Gibeoniten ausrotten wollte. Sieben Männer von der Nachkommenschaft Sauls werden 'zur Sühne der Gottheit' 'auf dem Berge vor Gott aufgehängt' und darauf, meint der derzeitliche Berichterstatter, 'habe Gott sich erbitten lassen' und die Hungersnoth gestillt. (II. Sam. XXI, 1-4.)—Aus den Saul'schen Kriegszügen vernehmen wir, Saul habe die Amalekiter nach einem glücklichen Treffen allesammt mit der Spitze des Schwertes gebannt und 'aus Mitleid' den König Agag am Leben erhalten. Darüber erzürnte der Seher Samuel und 'spaltete den Agag vor Jahwe in Gilgal.'—

Aus so tief verschlammten religiösen Vorstellungen hatte eine Religion klarer Ideen sich herauszuwinden, unter so schweren Geburtswehen erzeugte die israelitische Nation die Lehre, die Leben gibt und Leben hat für Alle.

Aber 'nicht auf einmal kreist ein Volk,' nicht an einem Tage gebiert es eine neue Religionswahrheit aus seinem Schoosse. Die Volksanschauungen sind nicht durch einen Federstrich—and sei es 'durch den Finger der Gottheit'—aus den Gemüthern auszureissen und auszujäten. Noch schmückte man die Gottheit mit dem Waffenschmuck des erlegten Goliath nach Art aller heidnischen Völker (I Sam.

XXI, 10). Noch war man mit den Anschauungen zu sehr verwachsen, dass man nur durch Bluthingabe eine zürnende Gottheit versöhnen müsse, nur beim Blute zertheilter Opferthiere Eide schwören und Bündnisse schliessen könne unter dem feierlichen Ausrufe: So thue mir Gott (wie diesem Opfer hier), wenn ich den Eid breche. Konnten da die Vertreter des religiösen Prinzips, die Priester-Seher, dieses Prinzip anders als mit der Mordwaffe zur Geltung bringen? anders als durch Blut den religiösen Genossenschaftsbund besiegeln und den Bundes-und Eidesbruch mit dem Blute des Verbrechers ahnden? Nicht blos der Bund, den Gott mit Abraham oder den Abramäern schloss (Genes. Cap. XV und XVII), auch noch der, den Moses im Namen Gottes mit dem Volke Israel schloss, musste nach dem Zeitgeiste mit Blut befestigt werden. Konnte demnach in der mosaischen Gesetzgebung die Drohung mit dem Tode, die Ahndung des Gesetzesbruchs durch Blut—gestrichen werden? Konnte, wenn und so lange des Volkes religiöser Sinn für die Entweihung des Landes, des Erdbodens, Blut forderte, weil 'dem Lande keine Sühne wird ob des darin vergossenen Blutes, es sei denn durch das Blut des mörderischen Vergiessers'—der Mord anders als durch die Todesstrafe gesühnt werden?—

Aus Furcht, aus dem Grauen vor einer höheren Uebermacht war, wie bei allen Menschen, Völkern wie Individuen, so auch dem hebräischen Volke das religiöse Prinzip erwachsen; durch Furcht vor dem strafenden Gott, vor dem Fluche, der jeder Sünde anhaftete, wurde der Menschheit auf der Kindesstufe Rechts-und Sittengesetze eingeprägt; darum sind alle alten Gesetze 'mit Blut geschrieben.' Konnten die Gesetze und die Handhaber des Rechts und der Religion dieses, den Bundesbruch rächenden Schwertes entbehren, um auf ein Volk einzuwirken, das auf derselben niederen Stufe der Kultur und der Gesittung stand, wie alle die Völker um sie herum? Gefürchtet musste Gott und das Göttliche erst werden, ehe sich Liebe zu ihm in den Gemüthern einwurzeln konnte. Mit schonungslosem Rache-eifer mussten die ersten Gottesmänner die Reinheit und höhere Einheit des Gottesgedankens, der sittlich-religiösen Ideen herstellen, mussten—weil es der Gang der Geschichte

forderte—die religiösen Gedanken geweckt, erhalten und gepflegt werden, bis die Zeit erstand, wo die grossen Wahrheitsseher an das Gefühl, an das sittliche Bewusstsein, an den Verstand des Volkes sich wenden konnten, wo ein Moses nicht mehr durch Blut rächen, durch Blut bestrafen musste, um für die göttliche Sache zu eifern (Exod. Cap. XXXII, Num. Cap. XVI und XV, 35), sondern es der Moses des Deuteronomikers (durch das ganze 5. Buch mit Ausschluss der älteren Geschichtsbestandtheile) thut, Liebe zu Gott predigen, höhere geistige Ideen von Gott aufstellen, die Religion zur religiösen Sittlichkeit hinüberleiten, die göttliche Heiligkeit, die ehemals mit Todesstrafe unnahbar gehalten wurde (vgl. Exod. XIX, 12ff., Num. IV, 20), dem Menschen nahbar machen, in seine eigene Brust versenken konnte und durfte. (Vgl. Deuter. XXX, 14; X, 12 u. s. w.)—War ja doch, wie die biblischen Urkunden uns selber in die natürliche Verknüpfung und Entwicklung der Dinge Einblick gewähren, der national-religiöse Eifer des grossen Religionsstifters Moses selbst durch den Gedanken der Rache gegen den ägyptischen Frohnherren, der einen seiner Brüder geschlagen hatte, geweckt und durch deren Folgen, die Flucht nach dem abrahamidischen Lande Midian, für die national-religiöse Freiheit des Volkes entzündet worden! Und konnte noch beim Untergange des Reiches Israel den Leidenden nur der Gedanke Trost gewähren, dass Gott "das Blut seiner Diener rächen und den blutgetränkten Erdboden seines Volkes sühnen" werde. (Deuter. XXXII, 43).

Und doch musste die kindische und unselbstständige Menschheit in das ihnen von der geschichtlichen Vorsehung verheissene Land der idealen Freiheit eingeführt werden, höhere, bessere und klarere Anschauungen in dem Geiste des zu erziehenden Volkes Raum finden, und sie fanden Raum. Aber wie? wodurch?

Nun eben durch Erziehung, durch die stufenweise fortschreitende und nach dem Bildungsgrade gehandhabte Gesetzgebung; also durch die Gesetze.

Die Gesetze, die alle im Namen des Moses gegeben und umgestaltet oder ausgebildet wurden, gehören nicht einer Zeit und gleichen staatlichen Verhältnissen an, wie der

oberflächlichste Blick lehrt. Was in der sinaitischen Periode auf der Stufe des Nomaden- oder wilden Beduinenlebens unter der Hegemonie des Reuben- oder des älteren Jakobstammes in religiöser Geltung und Uebung stand, das musste in der israelitischen Culturperiode 'diesseits des Jordans' unter josephitischer Hegemonie eine ganz andere Form bekommen, und musste nicht minder die straffe Concentration zum reineren und einheitlichen Religioncultus im Lande Juda höhere Bestrebungen fördernde Formen annehmen, wie sie im Deuteronomium zum Ausdruck kommen. So musste denn manche Gesetzestafel von der Hand eines vom Mosesgeist getragenen Propheten 'zerbrochen' werden, um einer besseren Platz zu machen, und manche Trümmer solcher alten Gesetze haben sich da neben den neuen erhalten. Manche alte Bräuche mussten in das neue Gesetzssystem eingefügt werden,⁵ trotz des inneren Widerspruchs, der sie von dem Ganzen losscheidet. Man suchte ihnen doch einen höheren Charakter zu geben und den tief im Sprach- und Volksgeiste eingewurzelten Brauch in gesetzliche Schranken einzuengen.

Wenden wir das Gesagte auf die Todesstrafe an. Da finden wir zum Beispiel einen solchen Trumm aus dem Gesetze einer kriegerisch-rauhen Zeit Levitic. XXVII, 29: "Was an Menschen gebannt wird, kann nicht losgekauft werden—er soll getödtet werden." Wir sehen, Jephtah hat nach der Kulturstufe seiner derzeitlichen Gesetze ganz recht gehandelt, in der Zeit des Josia oder der deuteronomischen Restauration wäre der Richter in Israel ein Mörder seines eigenen Kindes gewesen.—'Wer fremden Göttern opfert, verfällt in den Bann, ausser dem Gott Yahveh allein' lautet das alte sinaitische Gesetz. (Exod. XXII, 19). Was ein solcher Bann bedeutete, haben wir schon oben aus der Zeit Josua's u. s. f. gesehen: die Ermordung des ganzen Hauses; das levitische Gesetz (Levit. XX, 2) befiehlt, dass er aus der Mitte des Volkes ausgerottet werde, 'weil Todesschuld auf ihm haftet.' Das Deuteronomium (C. XXIV, 16) spricht es im Namen desselben Gottes aus, der in dem Zehn-Gebot "als der eifervolle Jahwe, der die Sünde der Väter an den Kindern, Enkeln und Urenkeln ahndet" sich offenbart hat: "Väter dürfen nicht zur Todesstrafe

herbeigezogen werden wegen der Kinder, und Kinder nicht wegen der Väter; Jeglicher für sein Verbrechen soll zur Todesstrafe herbeigezogen werden." Es verlangt aber auch genaue Untersuchung, sichere Bestätigung durch mehrere Zeugen, dass ein solcher offene Bundesbruch und Frevel gegen den heiligen, nationalen Einen Gott begangen worden, ehe es das Todesurtheil vollstrecken lässt (Deut. XVII, 2-7). Freilich muss es daneben auch—mitten im Kampfe oder vielleicht schon nach den Kämpfen gegen den hartnäckigen Hang zur unzüchtigen Vielgötterei des Phöniker-volks—das Gesetz (XIII, 13-19) mit einfügen, eine ganze Stadt, die solcher unzüchtigen Vielgötterei verfallen ist, mit Hab und Gut in den Bann zu thun und das Gottesurtheil ewiger Verwüstung über sie zu vollstrecken. Auch das grausame Kriegsgesetz: "Du sollst keine Seele am Leben lassen von den Völkern Kanaan's" musste noch seinen Platz finden, aber von dem Motiv begleitet, "damit die unzüchtigen Gräuelt, die im Namen der Gottheit von den Kanaanitern ausgeübt wurden, nicht verführerische Beispiele dem Volke abgeben." Dagegen wird Schonung und Milde für jeden anderen Krieg anbefohlen, man solle jeder zu bekriegenden Stadt erst den Frieden anbieten und das Volk alsdann leben lassen und unterwerfen (XX, 10-18).

Hat Moses ehemals an einem öffentlichen Sabbatschänder als Bundesverletzer die Todesstrafe durch Steinigung vollziehen lassen (Numer. XV, 35), so kennt das deuteronomische Gesetz für diese Sünde nicht die Todesstrafe, und ausser Mord nur noch für Ehebruch und für die sittliche Entartung des Sohnes und der Tochter (Cap. XVI, 21 und 22 und XXI, 18-21). An letzterer Stelle wird die väterliche Gewalt über Leben und Tod des Sohnes (die patria potestas, die bei den alten Römern und Griechen vorhanden war) den Eltern entzogen und auf das gesetzliche Maass einer Gemeinde-Justiz zurückgeführt.—

So sehen wir denn allmählig ein besseres Rechtsprinzip zum Durchbruch kommen, welches auf Verminderung der Todesstrafe abzielt.

Nur für ein Verbrechen hält die Bibel oder die religiöse Idee unbedingt—so scheint es—die Todesstrafe fest,—für den Mord. Allein, genauer besehen, zeigt sich auch hier

ein bedeutender gesetzlicher Fortschritt. Es ist schon an und für sich ein gewaltiger Fortschritt von der Blutrache zur Todesstrafe, den eben das Gesetz gewiss mit schwerem Kampf durchsetzte, es ist das die gesetzliche Regelung und Beschränkung der Blutrache. Der Verwandte war seinem Namen nach (Goel im Hebräischen und im Arabischen heisst der Rächer Tafr, mit dialektischer Verschiedenheit dasselbe, was im Hebräischen geradezu der Verwandte: Scheër bedeutet) der 'Bluteinforderer'; er wurde somit fort und fort vom Volksgeiste in der Sprache an seine heilige Pflicht, den ermordeten Verwandten zu rächen, gemahnt, insofern er eben Anverwandter war. Wird er da lange, wenn ein solcher Fall ihm vorlag, in seinem Schmerzensungestüm untersucht haben, ob die That vorsätzlich oder unvorsätzlich geschehen, ob ein beabsichtigter Mord oder ein unvorsichtiger Todschlag vorliegt? Nimmermehr; "das vergossene Blut musste mit dem Blute der Vergiessers bedeckt werden." Eher kam die Familie nicht zur Ruhe. Nach der anderen Seite hin mochte doch oft dem verletzten Rechtsgefühl keine Genüge geschehen, wenn der Mörder die heiligen Gottesstätten betrat und die Hörner des Altars umfasste, woselbst nach alter, allen Völkern gemeinsamen Vorstellung jedem Flüchtigen eine Sicherheit geboten war, und er an diesem Asyl der Hand der Rache entging. Da trat das sinaitische Gesetz ein mit folgenden Bestimmungen (Exod. XXI, 12–14): "Wer einen Menschen todtschlägt, wird getödtet. Aber wenn er ihm nicht feindlich nachgestellt und es Gott ihm so gefügt hat, da setze man einen Ort, der Gottheit heilig, fest, wohin er fliehen soll, (um vor dem Bluträcher sicher zu sein). So er jedoch mit frevelhaftem Entschluss ihn hinterlistig umgebracht hat, so soll auch der Altar ihn nicht vor der Todesstrafe sichern."—Zwischen Todschlag und Mord ist hier ein gesetzlicher Unterschied noch nicht getroffen. Dies stimmt vollends mit dem ganzen Prinzip des Wiedervergeltungsrechte, welches in der rein privatrechtlichen Natur der Blutrache begründet und daraus hervorgegangen ist, überein. Wo durch einen Streit eine Verletzung vorkommt, wird immer der Grundsatz gehandhabt; Leben um Leben, Auge um Auge, Zahn um Zahn, Hand um Hand, Fuss um Fuss, Wunde um Wunde.

Dieses jus talionis, das sich in allen älteren Gesetzgebungen und Bräuchen der Indier, Griechen, Römer und der heutigen Morgenländer u. s. f., findet, verblieb ohne höhere Entwicklung durch das ganze biblische Gesetz (vgl. Exod. XXI, 23, Levit. XXIV, 19 und Deut. XIX, 21), und erst die pharisäische Gesetzesumdeutung im fortschrittlichen Sinne gab diesem Satze die Bedeutung eines Schadenersatzes. Rechtlich war ja auch ein Ausgleich durch Vieh und dergleichen los, wie es (s. Burckhardt: Beduinen, S. 100, und Lane, Sitten und Gebräuche, I. S. 107) im Morgenland noch heute geschieht. Eine solche fand nach Josephus Antiq. IV, 8, 35 auch statt (vgl. Tract. Baba Kama 84 und Mekilta z. St.). Aus der privatrechtlichen Natur der Blutrache floss aber auch eine, das höhere Rechtsprinzip noch weniger als die Todesstrafe befriedigende Zulässigkeit oder Sitte, wie sie im heutigen Morgenlande noch üblich ist (vgl. Robinson Palestine I. 233 und Lane S. u. Gebr. I. 106), dass die Familie sich durch Geld entschädigen lässt für den getödteten Verwandten. Auch dies wird vom sinaitischen Gesetz noch als prinzipiell zulässig angenommen, wenigstens im Allgemeinen nicht beschränkt und im folgenden Falle anerkannt (Exod. XXI, 30): Wenn durch ein stössiges Vieh ein Mensch getödtet wird, fällt mit dem Thiere auch der Eigenthümer, wenn derselbe gewarnt worden, der Blutrache anheim, wörtlich ist der Gesetzesausdruck: er wird getödet. Wenn ihm aber eine Sühne auferlegt wird, d. h. wenn die Verwandten sich zum Ausgleich verstehen, so hat er die Lösung seines Lebens zu zahlen, wie sie ihm bestimmt wird. — Dass das Gesetz diesen aussergewöhnlichen Vergleich gerade hier als zulässig erklärt, hat seinen Grund darin, dass für eine durch Thiere veranlasste Tödtung von Menschen die Blutrache schon als hart erscheint, und so wird der gesetzlichen Todesstrafe eine Milderung absichtlich beigegeben.

Einen Fortschritt zu klareren und besseren Rechtsbestimmungen gewahren wir in der israelitischen Gesetzgebung zur Zeit, 'wo man den Jordan überschritten' und im Lande Kanaan sich festgesetzt hatte (Numer. XXXV, 9–34):

Hier wird vor Allem schon auf eine gemeinde-richterliche Rechtsverwaltung gedrungen, somit die Todesstrafe oder

bisherige Blutrache in die staatliche Rechtssphäre mit Bestimmtheit erhoben. Der Goel oder verwandte 'Bluteinlöser' kann ihn zwar nicht tödten, wenn er den Mörder trifft, aber nicht eher, als bis die That gerichtlich durch Zeugenverhör festgestellt und nach Untersuchung des Mordinstruments, nach Feststellung eines feindschaftlichen Verhältnisses zwischen dem Mörder und dem Gemordeten ein beabsichtigter Mord erwiesen ist. Die Zulässigkeit, die Seele des todesschuldigen Mörders durch Lösegeld loszukaufen, wird der Familie aberkannt. Dem unvorsätzlichen Mörder werden heilige Zufluchtsorte—heilige Kultusstätten mit Levitenbewohnern—geöffnet, in deren Bezirk er gegen die Blutrache geschützt wird; ausserhalb dessen aber ist er der Hand des Bluträchers rechtlich preisgegeben. Diese Verbannung nach dem Asylorte in Folge des unbeabsichtigten Mordes hat ihre rechtliche Giltigkeit, so lange als der Hohepriester lebt. Mit dem Tode desselben, das will sagen, mit dem Wechsel des obersten Lenkers oder Regenten der Theokratie tritt ein allgemein neues Rechtsverhältniss, eine allgemeine Amnestie ein, und der exilirte Todtschläger kann gesichert zu seinem Besitzlande zurückkehren.—Aus dieser Rechtsbestimmung können wir schon beiläufig bestimmen, dass wir uns noch nicht in der Zeit der consolidirten Monarchie befinden, die Frist der Freilassung, der Amnestie knüpft an den Priester, nicht an den König an. Das Gesetz gehört seinem Ursprunge nach der Richterzeit an.

Das judäisch deuteronomische Gesetzbuch (C. XIX, 1–13) kennt diese letztere Bestimmung nicht mehr; es schärft nur der gemeindlichen Gerichtsverwaltung ein, eine rechtlich unbegründete Blutrache zu verhüten, weil das so unschuldig vergossene Blut der Gemeinde zur Verantwortung anheim falle. Das ganze Institut der Blutrache aufheben konnte auch das judäische Gesetz noch nicht. Die Gemeinde-Aeltesten hatten das Urtheil wohl zu fällen, aber der Vollstrecker des Todesurtheils blieb der Goel. Ausdrücklich wird uns im Buche der Könige II 14, 5, als geschichtlich bedeutsame Thatsache erzählt, dass der am Ende des 9ten Jahrhunderts vor Chr. lebende König von Juda, Amazias, den Tod seines Vaters nur an den Mördern, nicht auch an den Kindern rächte. Damit also wurde das

schon oben erwähnte neue deuteronomische Gesetz (Deut. XXIV, 16) zur Geltung gebracht.

Die Mordthat wurde nicht mehr als blosser Schädigung der Familie behandelt, sondern als ein allgemeiner Rechtsbruch, als ein Frevel gegen das höchste national-religiöse Bewusstsein, gegen die Gottheit, die nunmehr Rache oder Sühne forderte. Gott, der höchste Ausdruck des national-religiösen Bewusstseins, Yahveh, wurde jetzt 'der Bluträcher' (Psalm IX, 13). "Yahveh sieht's und fordert's zurück" das vergossene unschuldige Blut—ist der herrschende Ausdruck (II Chronik XXIV, 22), das durch die nationalen Klagelieder in tausendfachem Echo nachklingt. Eine solche Sühne der Gottheit wird auch von diesem theokratischen Gesichtspunkte aus gefordert bei einem Mord von unbekannter Hand (Deut. XXI, 1–9) Die Gemeinde, in deren Bezirk ein Ermordeter gefunden wurde, hatte, wenn der Thäter sich nicht aufspüren liess, um die Todesstrafe an ihm zu vollziehen, ein Sühnopfer zu bringen und ihre Nichtwissenschaft zu betheuern. Der Gemeinde fällt somit die Verantwortlichkeit jedes Rechtsbruches anheim, und sie als die öffentliche Gerichtsbarkeit hat das verletzte Recht zu sühnen.

Das sind freilich noch schwache Anfänge eines ordentlichen Rechtsverfahrens; das sind keine politisch-juridische, sondern theokratische Rechtsbestimmungen. Allein in der Theokratie lag doch schon die Anerkennung eines allgemeinen sittlichen Rechtsprinzips, und die niedere Sphäre des Privatrechts war in der politisch-religiösen Rechtsverwaltung überwunden. Auf dieser Stufe blieb die biblische Gesetzgebung stehen; durch den Verfall und Untergang des Staats war sie in ihrer freien Entwicklung und Fortbildung gehemmt. Das Streben über diese Anfänge hinaus zukommen, ist im Deuteronomium durchsichtig genug, und das Prinzip, Milde im Strafverfahren eintreten zu lassen, damit auch der sittlich gesunkene Mensch vor seinem Mitmenschen nicht ganz seiner Würde entkleidet würde, wird Cap. XV, 3 deutlich ausgesprochen. Man will also nicht bloss eine verbrecherische That sühnen, das bedeutet nach alter Anschauung—den Fluch, der auf der Sünde lastet, ablenken, sondern man will den Frevler strafen, dass er sich bessere.

Seine Menschenwürde soll ihm noch bleiben, damit er daran sich anklammere, um seine Gesinnungen zu besseren umzugestalten, um innerhalb der menschlichen Gesellschaft einen würdigeren Platz einzunehmen, um nicht von ihm ausgestossen und zur Nichtswürdigkeit verdammt zu sein.

Ob nicht aus dieser Besserungstheorie schon an sich bei weiterer Rechtsentwicklung der Grundsatz zur Geltung gekommen wäre, dass man auch dem ärgsten Verbrecher in der menschlichen Gesellschaft, dem Mörder noch die Möglichkeit gebe oder belasse, sich zu bessern, dem religiösen Prinzip, gegen das er gefrevelt, durch ein gebessertes sittliches Leben, Genugthuung, dem Staat, dem er ein brauchbares Mitglied geraubt, in seiner Person einen brauchbaren Bürger, wie er ehemals nicht war, wieder zu geben? Wir können aus dem Wortlaut der uns vorliegenden Gesetze es kaum entscheiden, in keinem Falle aber die Frage verneinen, unsomehr als wir schon oben darauf aufmerksam gemacht haben dass die jüdische Gesetzgebung eine Minderung der theokratischen Todesstrafen entschieden durchsetzen will. Die spätere nachexilische Jurisdiktion, die, vertreten durch die sadokitische oder sadduzäische Priesteraristokratie das alte mosaische Gesetz so gut wie möglich mit aller Stabilität buchstäblich restaurirte, wurde von dem fortschreitenden Rechtsbewusstsein des Volkes immer mehr zur Milderung des criminellen Strafverfahrens gedrängt, und die spätere pharisäische Volkspartei hob das ganze Prinzip der Wiedervergeltung, das *jus talionis*, auf und suchte die Todesstrafe durch allerlei Rechtsklauseln und erschwerten Zeugenverhör in vielen Fällen illusorisch zu machen. So konnten die pharisäischen Lehrer, die Rabbinen, sagen: Das ist schon eine mörderische Gerichtsbarkeit, die alle 7 Jahre ein Todesurtheil vollstreckt. (Makkot. 7a). Der Verfall des Staats unter der römischen Uebermacht hob die Criminaljustiz bei den Juden ganz auf, und die spätere Rechtscasuistik ist nicht dem Leben, sondern der Schule entwachsen. Nicht diese, überhaupt niemals den starren Buchstaben des Gesetzes, sondern den Geist, der über den Gesetzen schwebt, die Ideen, die aus dem alten Stamm neue Keime sittlicher Anschauungen hervortreiben, wollen wir nunmehr befragen, ob diese

schlechthin und für alle Zeiten die Todesstrafe verlangen?

Hören wir jene tiefreligiöse Volksanschauung aus der biblischen Sagenwelt erklingen! Sie erzählt uns, dass vom ersten Brüderpaare der Eine ein Mörder war, dass aber Gott dem Mörder das Leben sicherte und ihn der Blutrache entzog. Den ersten Mörder hat also Gott begnadigt.— Zur Zeit David's vernehmen wir die Sprache einer weisen Frau aus Tekoah (II. Sam. XIV): "Eine Witwe bin ich und hatte zwei Söhne. Diese stritten mit einander und der Eine schlug den Andern todt. Die ganze Familie will nun den mir noch gebliebenen Sohn heraushaben, um ihn für das Leben des Erschlagenen hinzuopfern. Damit will man den Funken, der mir noch geblieben, ganz auslöschen, damit gar kein Name und Andenken meinem Hause bleibt." Sie sprach das mit Anspielung auf das politische Verhältniss der künftigen Thronerben David's: Amnon war von Absalom aus Rache einer an seiner Schwester begangenen Schandthat ermordet worden; sollte nun Absalom auch fallen und das Reich keinen Thronerben haben? Aber in diesen Worten spricht sich auch eine allgemeine Wahrheit aus, die auch für uns heute noch beherzigenswerth ist. Ein Glied der menschlichen Gesellschaft ist gefallen; ist der Menschheit damit gedient, wenn auf das Blut des Einen noch neues Blut vergossen wird? Sollte ein höheres Rechtsprinzip nicht einen höheren, befriedigenden Ausgleich finden können.

Das sind schwere Bedenken, die gar gewichtig in die Wagschale fallen, die zur Aufhebung der Todesstrafe bestimmen sollten.—Hat aber nicht die Gottheit, als sie mit der nach der Sinnfluth neuerstandenen Menschheit den Bund schloss, für alle Zeiten gesprochen: "Wer Menschenblut vergiesst, dessen Blut soll durch Menschen wieder vergossen werden" (Genes. IX, 6)?

Wir sagen: Nein, nicht für alle Zeiten dem Buchstaben nach, für alle Zeiten der Idee nach. Dem Buchstaben nach nicht, weil dieser Gesetzesbuchstabe auch die Blutrache im Namen Gottes fordert, weil das höhere Rechtsprinzip im fortschrittlichen Bewusstsein durch die rohe ungesetzliche oder vom Gesetz nicht überwachte Rache nicht zum

Ausdruck kommt. Wohl aber der Idee nach, denn die begründende Ursache lautet: "Denn im Ebenbilde der Gottheit hat sie den Menschen gemacht." Der Gottheit soll also Genüge geschehen dafür, dass ein gottähnliches Wesen unschuldig vernichtet worden. Geschieht aber diese Genugthuung immer für alle Zeiten, für jedes zeitliche Rechtsbewusstsein dadurch, dass man noch einen in Gottes Ebenbild geschaffenen Menschen aus der Welt vernichtet? Allein der Mörder hat—so könnte man sagen—eben diese Gottähnlichkeit eingeübt! Nun denn, wenn die höhere Göttlichkeit in dem Verbrecher sich nicht mehr abspiegelt, so gebe man ihm Gelegenheit, dass er jenes verlorene Bild sittlich-religiöser Anschauung finde oder wiederfinde, damit auch er Gott ähnlich werde.

Spricht der Prophet Ezechiel nicht noch heute zu uns und auch für unsere Frage verständlich genug (Cap. XVIII, 23ff.): Will ich denn den Tod des Frevlers? spricht der Herr. Fürwahr, wenn er zurückkert von seinem Wandel, mag er leben . . . Ich will nicht, dass der Todeswürdige sterbe; Bessert Euch und lebet!"—

Wir sind mit der Betrachtung der biblischen Rechtsanschauungen zu Ende. Fassen wir unsere Resultate kurz zusammen, so finden wir den besten Ausdruck dafür in folgender uralten hagadischen Parabel:

Man fragte die Menschenweisheit: Was ist die Strafe des Verbrechers? Ihre Antwort war: "Die schuldige Person muss sterben."—Man fragte die heilige Schrift und sie antwortete: Der Schuldige bringe eine Sühne.—Man fragte die Gottheit selbst: da lautete die Antwort: Er bessere sich und ihm werde verziehen, denn "Gut und gerade ist Gott, darum lehrt er den Sünder noch den Weg der Besserung finden." (Ps. XXV, 8.).

In diese 3 Worte lässt sich der religiöse Fortschritt in den sittlichen Anschauungen der Menschheit auch innerhalb der Bibel zusammenfassen: Von der Wiedervergeltung zur Sühne, von der Sühne zur Gnade und zum Erbarmen schreitet die religiöse Idee fort.—Ja, Erbarmen mit dem Sünder, Liebe auch noch für den Gefallenen, ist das Gebot wahrer Religiosität, wie sie die edlen Geister der Menschheit gewollt und erstrebt haben. Nicht erst drüben im Jenseits,

hier auf der Erdenwelt muss der Verbrecher sich mit seinem Gotte versöhnen lernen. Innerhalb des Staats, im 'Lande der Lebenden' muss, soll das politische Wesen, die sittliche Verfassung des Staates nicht unvollkommen, unzureichend sein, dem Bürger und Menschen sein 'Himmel und Hölle' geboten sein; wie die theokratische Gesetzgebung des Moses muss die höhere politische Gesetzgebung 'Segen und Fluch,' Lohn und Strafe in ihrem Bereiche haben; die Todesstrafe steht ausser ihrem Bereiche. Sie schneidet dem Verbrecher die Möglichkeit zur Versöhnung mit Gott und der menschlichen Gesellschaft ab; sie greift in das religiöse Prinzip ein, und dieses will Gnade, Erbarmen.

II. ADDRESSES

THE MISSION OF ISRAEL AND ITS APPLICATION TO MODERN TIMES

IT IS a strange psychological fact—or shall we call it caprice?—that the idea of Israel's mission, which forms the very soul and life force of the Jewish people in its history and religious literature, should need a defence against those modern spokesmen of the Jew who deny or question it from mere opposition to Reform Judaism which placed it into the foreground of Jewish belief. It is perfectly intelligible and logical, if atheists of the type of Nordau and Kallen scoff at the idea, since for them no divine Providence directs the affairs of men, history being merely a haphazard complex of events, a kaleidoscopic view of accidental happenings of nations or groups of men. So may the pure scientist, bent only upon investigating the laws of nature, say, in his conceit, as did the astronomer Laplace when reminded by Napoleon of having left God out of his system: "I do not need this hypothesis." Seeing only the working of causes in the cosmic order of things, he fails to discover purpose, except as far as man injects it, and, unmindful of the necessity of a final or supreme Cause, he insists that evolution does away with teleology. Thus he declares that, instead of the sun having been created to give light and earth to produce life, as we are taught in Scripture, these cosmic bodies become what they are by the various degrees of motion and speed in their rotation through the infinite space. To be sure, where mechanism rules the cosmos, there is no room for purpose. Neither can there be any historic task for nations or races in such a system. As soon, however, as we realize that the wonderful harmony and order prevailing in the universe cannot be the product of mere chance, but manifest an all-comprising design and forethought, both in nature and in human history, working in the one by compulsion from *without* and in the other through self-determination or freedom from *within*, so soon are we bound to observe the working out of higher plans, or historic tasks

for the social or spiritual progress of life by the combined efforts of certain groups of men. Such tasks are in response to the call of a nation's spirit or genius, with more or less consciousness, accomplished by the various nations in history, each contributing its share to the work of human civilization. Accordingly we may ascribe to Greece the culture of art and philosophy as its mission, and to Rome that of jurisprudence and statecraft, and, going further back in antiquity, we would find astronomy and arithmetic first developed in Babylonia, and architecture and the beginnings of art and literature as the products of Egypt. Thus each prominent nation or race, ancient or modern, appears to have been fitted out for some specific task which it was, or is, in due time called upon to perform.

But here the question comes up, whether we have a right to call these chosen people—just as Israel is called *the* chosen people—as does Israel Zangwill in his interesting but at the same time half-serious and half-sarcastic article, Chosen People, in the Menorah Journal. In other words, can, or should, we place the historic mission of all other nations or races on the same level as is claimed for Israel's world mission? Or shall we go to the other extreme and allow Asher Ginzberg, the much overrated imitator of Nietzsche, to tell us 'the reformers' that we have invented the famous theory of Israel's mission among the nations? Surely this calls for our strongest possible refutation and protest. Notice the fact that in calling the Jewish nation a *Supernation*, exactly as Nietzsche speaks of certain classes of men as types of the *Superman*, the philosophy of Ahad ha Am exalts it at the expense of divine Revelation, ignoring all the historic evidences, that only its religious truth, its pure ethical monotheism as its dynamic force, ever growing and expanding under the influence of the various civilizations, made it great and 'high above all other nations.'

Of course, as long as prophetic universalism had not been attained or conceived of by the Jewish mind, as long as Israel's God was of a tribal and local character as was any of the heathen deities, the idea of a world mission could not be thought of. Neither could the idea of a world mission ever take hold of any of the great nations in view of their

superior culture, since for them there existed no World-Ruler nor God of History to assign to them their task. For the Greeks or Egyptians, to mention only these, the other nations were simply the inferiors, despised barbarians or unclean foreigners to be shunned; not kinsmen, members of the same human family to be won over for their ideas or elevated by their superior knowledge and skill. The thought of a providential mission never dawned upon their mind.

Quite different was the attitude of the Jewish people when the great prophets—as God’s heralds—and in their train the psalmists and sages, proclaimed to them their world-task and world-duty in view of the superiority of their religious truth. It is shutting one’s eyes wilfully to the light of the scriptural and rabbinical teachings to say with *Ahad ha Am* that the Jewish people was elected by God simply for the attainment of the highest morality for themselves on a territory of their own, without concern in the spiritual welfare of the world around. Can there be a more luminous and more definite enunciation of Israel’s mission than the one that is given in the words of the great anonymous prophet:

“Behold, My servant whom I uphold,
Mine elect in whom My soul delighteth,
I have put My spirit upon him;
He shall make the right to go forth to the nations . . .
I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness,
And have taken hold of thy hand, and kept thee,
And set thee for a covenant of the people,
For a light of the nations.” (Isaiah XLII, 1-6)

Or in the still more striking 49th chapter, where he says:

“Listen, O Isles, unto Me,
And hearken ye people from afar:
The Lord hath called me from the womb,
Yea, He saith, It is too light a thing that thou shouldst
be My servant
To raise up the tribe of Jacob,
And to restore the offspring of Israel;
I will also give thee for a light of the nations,
That My salvation be unto the end of the earth.”
(V, 1-6).

And far from claiming any greatness for Israel to boast of as a supnation, the seer addressed it as, "Thou worm, Jacob!" (XLI, 14) and reproaches it, saying: "Who is blind but My servant, or deaf as My messenger whom I have sent."¹ The highest title bestowed upon it is that of the 'Servant of the Lord' (XLII, 19), with the special implication that he is to undergo suffering and woe, 'to be smitten and bruised for the healing of the nations' (XLII; L, 6; LIII, 1). God declares Israel to be His 'witnesses' (XLIII, 10-12), 'the people which I have formed, that they might tell of My praise' (XLIII, 21).

Not general culture, such as the great nations of history imparted to mankind in various forms and in larger measure than the Jew ever could, but the religious truth, the prime source of all ethics centred in the Only One God, the God of Righteousness and Holiness whom Israel is to proclaim to the ends of the earth (XLV, 5, 21-23), as 'the light by which the nations shall walk' (LX, 1-3): this is the gift of Israel's genius to the world. Yet only when the great prophets had risen to the high watch-tower of history to survey the destiny of the nations near and far, there opened before them the wide outlook upon the world to be conquered for their all-encompassing truth. Nay more. Only when the great seer of the exile (it matters not whether he lived in Babylonia or, as more recent research seems to show, in some Palestinian border town) had come within reach of the broader views and aims of the world-conqueror, Cyrus, and the larger mental horizon of the Persian empire, did he become imbued with the spirit of Israel's mission and behold the whole of humanity, 'all the people on earth,' as the object of God's care and of Israel's mission (see Duhm Isaiah, XLII, 5).

Also the glorious messianic prophecy in Isaiah II, 2-4, and Micah IV, 1-4, speaking of 'the end of days when the nations shall go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, to be taught of His ways and learn to walk in His paths, for out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the word of God from Jerusalem' points to the larger view obtained in the Exile and voiced by Trito-Isaiah when he speaks of "the aliens that will join themselves to the Lord"

and then continues: "Even them I will bring to My holy mountain and make them joyful in My house of prayer. . . For My house shall become a 'house of prayer for all peoples' " (Isaiah XVI, 6-7). Instead of seeing Israel go forth among the nations to win them for its Only One God, these prophecies have the nations flow to Judea's capital, attracted by the truth taught there in order to make Israel's God their own.

In the light of this world mission announced by the one or the other prophecy, the early history of Israel was then construed by the prophetic writer who has the giving of the Decalogue of Sinai introduced by the majestic proclamation: "Ye have seen . . . how I bore you on eagle's wings and brought you unto Myself. Now if ye will hearken unto My voice, . . . ye shall be Mine own treasure from among all peoples, for all the earth is Mine. And ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Ex. XIX, 3-6). Let Zangwill in his above-quoted article declare this mere fiction, the fact remains that the biblical writer wants to have it understood (as I said in my article on the Chosen People in the J. E.) that the Jewish people began their career conscious of their life purpose and world duty as God's priests, and as the teachers of a universal religious truth. Let Prof. James A. Montgomery, who certainly does not write from any Jewish bias, be heard on the subject: "I am not discussing the historic truth of this historic mission," he says in his beautiful sketch of *The Hebrew Religion*, in the volume, *Religion of the Past and Present*, Lipincott, 1919, p. 110. "My point is that Israel regarded itself from early days as a people with a future and a destiny, and ultimately with a mission in the world. This idea appears in the antique odes called *The Blessings of Jacob* and of *Moses*, and the cycle of the *Balaam poems* (Gen. XLIX, Deut. XXXIII and Num. XXIff.). It is by no means adequately explained from Israel's political or intellectual genius. Neither Egypt nor Babylonia produced such a consciousness. The nearest to it is that of Greece and Rome, but the greatness of those people is the explanation of their claims. Israel's consciousness is due to its religion, to an original idea concerning its God's purpose which it never

let go, and which it always amplified in historic connection with the past."

Indeed, the introductory chapters of Genesis, as far as they belong to the Priest Code, beginning with the first man and culminating in God's covenant with Noah, the father of the new humanity, indicate, as is well shown by Berthelot in his instrutive work, *Die Stellung der Israeliten u. Juden zu den Fremden*, p. 175f, the universalistic spirit which permeated Judaism since the Exile. Ranke, the great historian, goes even so far as to say that the first ten chapters of Genesis, which form the ground work of biblical or Israelitish history, did more than any literature for the interlinking of the nations to make mankind one. Upon this basic idea the hope could well be expressed by the later prophets that 'the whole earth shall be filled with the glory of God as the waters cover the sea' (Hab. II, 14, comp. Is. XI, 14); or that, "On that day the Lord will become King of the whole earth; on that day the Lord will be One and His name One" (Zech. XIV, 9). But the most important feature of post-exilic Judaism is its *denationalization*, owing to the admission of the stranger under the name of *Ger* (Proselyte) (Isaiah XIV, 1). It was rather a long process which led from a mere political or civic to a religious incorporation of this element of affiliated foreigners, but it ultimately became a prominent factor in the missionary activity of Judaism of the pre-Christian centuries. It opened wide the gates of the Synagogue to let the non-Jews enter, and in the words of Deutero-Isaiah (XLIV, 4) to have the one say: "I am the Lord's, and another call himself by the name of Jacob," in which also the Midrash (Mek. Mishpatim, 18) finds a mandate for proselytism. Still, regarding the condition of admission of the non-Jew, the views seem to have differed from the very beginning. The priestly or legalistic view prevailing in Judea was that he had at least to bring an offering (קרבן גר) consecrating himself symbolically to the service of God, whereby he became גר צדק—a Proselyte of (the city of) Righteousness (See my Jewish Theology, 415), fully to enter into the Israelitish covenant with all its ritualistic obligations. The more universalistic view is expressed in the 15th Psalm (comp. Ps. XXIV, 3ff): "O Lord, who

shall be a guest (*Ger* or adopted stranger) in Thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in Thy holy mountain? He that walketh uprightly, etc." (See Cheyne's, Commentary and Lucius, d. Essenismus, 116f). The observance of the ethical precepts as the law of God is, according to this, to constitute the character of one who wishes to be a true Israelite. It was this spirit which actually created the class of 'God worshippers' " יְרֵאִי alongside of the other three classes of Jews, 'the house of Aaron, of Levi and of Israel' (Ps. CXV, 9-11; CXVIII, 19-20; CXXXV, 19-20). This class, called later יְרֵאִי שְׂמִים played a great role, as we shall see, in the Jewish propaganda of the Diaspora. But the Psalms in general, while exalting, in ever new strains of song, Him who dwells 'enthroned on the praises of Israel,' echoed forth in mighty appeals Israel's mission to proclaim God's deeds, His praise, His truth and mercy to the nations near and far, as was pointed out by Berthelot (eodem) and Bousset (*Relig. des Judenth*, 2, p. 94) (See Ps. IX, 12; XVIII, 50; XXII, 28; XLVII, 2; XLVIII, 11; LVII, 10; LXVII, 8; XCIII; XCV; C; CII, 16; CV, 1; CXXXVIII, 4). And so is the book of Jonah justly characterized by Bousset as a work written for the very purpose of defending the right of Israel's mission among the heathens.

Of course, all these sporadic conversions of heathen individuals became frequent and systematic in the land of Hellenic culture, in Alexandria and the various commercial colonies where Jew met Greek. Here the great opportunity came to familiarize the heathen world with the truths of Judaism and win it for Israel's God. It was a question between the intellectual or spiritual superiority of the one or the other mode of thought, between the beauty of Japheth and the loftiness of Shem. The great step towards such a *rapprochement* and competition was first taken by the translation of the Scripture into Greek, which opened up the treasures of Judaism to the cultured world in the popular idiom. Whatever fault a later period found with the Septuagint, the idea that the Torah was intended for all mankind and should be brought home to the knowledge of all nations is reflected in the significant rabbinical saying that the Ten Words of Sinai were flashed forth in *seventy* tongues

of fire in order to reach the *seventy* nations of the world—a saying reechoed in the Pentecost miracle of the New Testament,³ and in the similar saying that the words of the Law were, in accordance with God's command to Moses, engraved in *seventy* languages by Joshua upon the stones of the altar on the Jordan shore.⁴ A parallel to this is the Midrash (Mek. Yithro, I), "The Torah was given in the wilderness, which is the common property of all, in order that no nation might say it was not meant for us." The great Jewish propaganda carried on by an astonishingly large literature, which made the heathen oracles, such as the Sibylline books and ancient Greek poets proclaim Jewish truths in order to make the heathen world repent and turn it into proselytes observing the humanitarian, the so-called Noahitic, laws, must have achieved great results, before the Christian Church took up this mission work of the Jew and reaped its great harvest in the field ploughed and sown by him. Nor can this activity of the Jews of that period have been disregarded or underrated by the Palestinian teachers, or else they would not have made Abraham the prototype of a wandering missionary going about to win souls for his God; he converting the men, and his wife Sarah the women (Ber. R. to Gen. XII, 5), and in proclaiming God to his fellow-creatures, 'thereby changing the God of heaven into the God of the earth' (Gen. R. to Gen. XXIV, 3). Henceforth the blessing: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. XII, 3; comp. Gen. XLVIII, 20), was given a spiritual meaning in the sense that *by* him, that is, *through* the truth he would disseminate, the world should be blessed.⁵

Accordingly we find Hillel to have been active in making proselytes 'to bring them under the wings of the *Shekinah*,' following the example of Abraham (Ab. d. R. Nathan (ed. Schechter), p. 53f.). And this view of Israel's mission seems to have been especially fostered in the house of Hillel, as Simeon ben Gamaliel handed down a Mishnah no longer contained in ours, stating: "If a stranger (*Ger*) desires to espouse the Jewish faith, we extend to him the hand of welcome in order to bring him under the wings of the *Shekinah*" (Lev. R. II, 8), whereas Shammai and his school,

especially Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, opposed proselytism of all kind (Shab. 31a; Gen. R. LXX, 5; B. M. 59b). Of course, the enforced conversions of the Idumeans and Itureans by John Hyrcanus (Josephus, Ant. XII, 8, 1), and similarly such as had political and social advantage or fear as motive, were generally deprecated.⁶ Still the number of proselytes under King Herod and afterwards seems to have been quite large among the very prominent class of Romans, as shown by Graetz, *Die juedischen Proselyten im Roemerreich*. (Compare Bousset, *Relig. d. Judenth*, 2, pp. 90-97.) Especially noteworthy is Philo's remark (*Vita Mosis* II, 20), concerning "the power of attraction and conversion exercised by the Mosaic Law on Barbarians and Hellenes, the people of the East and the West, of Europe and Asia, the whole inhabited globe from one end to the other." Nor was this due merely to the extensive Hellenic propaganda. The striking utterance of Jesus in Matthew 23, 15: "Woe unto ye Scribes and Pharisees, ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte" betrays a systematic missionary activity also on the part of Judea's authorities. And this has been confirmed by Jellinek's reference to Midrash, Gen. R., XXVIII, 5; Cant. R., I, 4, where the words of Zephaniah, II, 5: "Woe to the inhabitants of the sea-coast, the nation of Kerethites" are interpreted to mean that the inhabitants of the pagan lands would be doomed to perdition (*Kareth*), were it not for the *one* God-fearing proselyte who is won over each year and set up to save the heathen world. We also possess a Halakik survival of a rule concerning proselytism in Sifre to Deut. XXIII, 16-17 (comp. Targ. Y.), where the verses in question have been taken to mean: "Thou shalt not surrender him who flees from his former gods to make him again worship their masters, but assign to him a place in one of thy gates or cities where he is to be supported as a semi-proselyte" גר חושב. That such was the actual practice of former times may be learned from Philo (*De Monarchia*, I, 7, and elsewhere), who tells of *hospices* prepared for the proselyte who comes to espouse the truth of Judaism, having fled from the falsehood of idolatry (comp. Berthelot l. c. 285-288; Schuerer, *G. V. Is.* III, 31ff., and Kohler, *Aseneth*, in J. E.). It would lead too far, were

I to dwell here on the origin and development of the two classes of proselytes, the גר צדק called also גר שער 'Proselyte of the Gate' (probably after the Sifre just quoted comp. Tos. Negain, VI, 2), and the full proselyte גר צדק who at an early period became the object of a special prayer in the Eighteen Benedictions alongside of the *Hasidim* and the *Soferim*.

With the rise of Christianity the whole attitude of Judaism to proselytism changed. The Church took hold of the mission idea and mission activity of the Jew in the Diaspora, appropriating even the Jewish Manual for Proselytes (see Didache in J. E.) and giving it a Christian character. Especially did Paul, the Apostle of the heathen, as we learn from the Acts, take these very Synagogues of the Diaspora, in which 'the God-worshippers' or semi-proselytes formed a conspicuous and most susceptible element, for his field of missionary activity, claiming to do away with the difference between the circumcized and the uncircumcized, and making them all one in his belief in the Atoning Christ. As the enmity sown by him against Judaism widened the gulf between the Jew and the Christian, and many of the latter during the Hadrianic war turned into maligners of the former, proselytism was altogether discouraged by the Jewish authorities. To compete with the powerful Church had become an impossibility. Proselytism had become a peril. The ancient Mishnah of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel quoted above was eliminated, and the rule adopted by the Synagogue was given in the Baraitha (Yeb. 47a; Mas. Gerin I, 1), beginning thus: "If a person in this time desires to be admitted into the Jewish fold, he is to be acquainted with the sad lot of the Jewish people and their martyrdom and thus dissuaded from joining. Should he, however, persist, let him be instructed in the principal laws, etc." The gloomy view prevailed, owing to the ever-increasing hardship and oppression, so that R. H̄lbo of the 4th century declared (Yeb. eodem and elsewhere): "The proselytes have become as dire a plague as leprosy to the house of Jacob," taking the word ונספחו as an allusion to ספחה—'leprosy.' What a striking contrast to the utterance of R. Eleazar ben Pedath, the disciple of Rab and R. Johanan, so emphatic in the

enunciation of Israel's mission: "God dispersed the people of Israel among the heathen nations only for the purpose that they may win over so many proselytes; for this is what God said through Hosea, II, 25: 'I will sow her unto Me in the earth (land)'—that is to have a rich harvest reaped everywhere from Israel's spiritual seed" (Pes. 87b).

And yet the mission idea was never altogether lost sight of. R. Hēlbo's own disciple, R. Berekiah, as if in mere protest to his teacher, said: "The time will come when the proselytes will be even rendered priests in the sanctuary" (in accordance with Isaiah LXVI, 21), the words נספחו being an allusion rather to the word ספחתי used for admission to the priestly function (I Sam. XI, 36). And there are numerous Agadic passages speaking in words of high praise of the proselytes, which I need not quote here. Quite instructive in that respect is the remark made by both R. Joseph and R. Ashi in Babylonia: "You are too harsh of heart: with all your gathering for the Torah; with all your charity work you have not succeeded in making *one* proselyte" (Ber. 17b). Suffice it to state that, however narrow the outlook of the Jew became during the dark ages, his synagogal liturgy voiced the universalism of prophetic Judaism for him each year in the sublime New Year's and Atonement Day's prayer for 'the time when all the people on earth shall form one bond of brotherhood to do God's bidding with a perfect heart,' and again in the *Alenu* prayer recited at the close of each service, which echoes the hope for the speedy establishment of God's kingdom, when all flesh will unite in the worship of the One God. Is there any further proof needed of the fact that Israel's religious mission was the very heart-throb and pulsating nerve of Judaism in the past? Or could there be a fuller recognition of Judaism's historic world mission than is presented by the great medieval authorities Jehudah Halevi, Maimonides and Nachmanides when they in unison declare that the Christian and Mohammedan religions were entrusted by Divine Providence with the task of preparing the heathen world for the final triumph of the pure Jewish Monotheism in the Messianic Kingdom. (Cuzari, IV, 23; Yad. H. Melakim, XI, 41; and Nachmanides, Derashah (ed. Jellinek), 5.). As a matter of fact, the mission

idea is inseparable from the Messianic hope for the universal kingdom of God. The Messiah himself, says the Midrash, bears the name Hadrak (Zech. IX, 1) as the one who is 'to bring back' all the nations to God (Cant. R., VII, 10).

II

Having thus far dwelt at length on the *doctrinal* side of Israel's mission, we must now consider the *practical* side. "How did you verify this claim?" ask our opponents. "What has the Jewish people ever done, and what are you, Reformers, doing in fulfilment of this mission? The Christian Church has gone forth as the great proselytizer of the heathen and converted all Europe and Western Asia to her creed. Mohammedanism, despite its national character and its rigor, has won well-nigh all Africa and much of Asia for its system of belief. Buddhism has conquered almost all Eastern Asia. Judaism,—not to speak of the Hellenistic propaganda which was the precursor of the world-wide Church mission, or of the sporadic conquests in Africa or in the Crimea,—remained in its isolation, allowing only individuals to join it, but never taking steps to win the masses for its sublime faith. In the opinion of Christian writers, such as Max Mueller, Kuenen and others, ours has ever been a national, not a missionary religion." How, then, are we to meet the challenge of our antagonists? The answer is not far to find, if we only keep the one important fact in mind that our mission differs in toto from what is usually understood by this term. The Church in her efforts to conquer the heathen world was to a large extent conquered herself by the heathen view. Having started in the name of Israel's God, she had, in order to win the nations for her faith, to enter into all kinds of compromise, whether in regard to the unity and spirituality of God or in regard to the unity of mankind and of the cosmos. So under the influence of the Egyptian and other trinitarian systems God was divided into three personalities and, in consequence thereof, also mankind into believers and unbelievers, and the Cosmos between the good and evil power represented by Christ and Satan. Thus faith and

reason, religion and science, the sacred and the secular were opposed to one another, and instead of having religion made 'the all-uniting mother leading mankind to God as the Father of All,' as Maimonides calls it at the close of his Commentary to *Eduyot*, it became a disuniting force for the human race. And the same holds, of course, still more true of the other religious systems. Against all this the Jewish people had, amidst oppression and persecution, the peculiar mission assigned to them of being 'witnesses' to God in His absolute Unity and sublime Holiness. And to be witnesses meant, as the Greek translation 'martyrs' suggests, to testify to the truth held forth by them by offering up their very lives in martyrdom for it. Noble as the heroic task accomplished by many a Christian missionary indisputably was, the task of the Jew during the dark mediæval centuries of withstanding all the trials, the threats, and taunts, the *auto da fes* and the alluring baits of the Church was by all means far nobler and more heroic, and it was performed not by individuals, but by the entire people. It was a passive, not an active mission. Had they then gone forth among the nations to win the world for their teachings, they might have long ago been swallowed up by the surrounding multitude. Instead of this, the Jew proved to be the 'Servant of the Lord' who 'gave his back to the smiters,' 'the man of sorrows, despised and forsaken of men,' 'wounded and crushed because of others' transgressions,' 'like a lamb led to the slaughter who opened not his mouth,' yet whose 'stripes were to be the healing of the nations' (*Isaiah* L, 6; LIII). A two thousand years' history of martyrdom, a tragedy without parallel in the world and yet sustained by a faith which never faltered and with words of praise and sanctification of the Most High which resound throughout the centuries—this was the wondrous realization of the Deutero-Isaianic prophecy, for the grandeur of which our Nationalists have as little appreciation as have our anti-semitic enemies. Well may the words of the English poet be applied here: "They also serve who only stand and wait." And for what did the Jew wait all these centuries? Not for his mere national resurrection or for the rebuilding of a state like any other, but for the new

and grander revelation of God's glory, for the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth.

Nor was the mission of the mediaeval Jew altogether a passive one. He stood out indeed as 'a light to the nations and a covenant of the people.' In the midst of the dense darkness that covered the nations all around, his lamp of learning shone brightly in the humblest hut and diffused its rays into the cells of the monastery and into the abode of the solitary thinker of Christendom. Jews, intermediating between Arabic culture and Christian Europe, held the torch of philosophy and science aloft to enlighten and nurture the minds of the scholastics and the pioneers of the universities, and usher in the era of the Renaissance and of the Reformation. So also did the Jewish men of commerce, while carrying material goods from land to land, transport the popular wisdom and folklore of the East to the West to interlink distant civilizations. Like Lessing's Nathan the Wise, the Jew, standing between Moslem and Christian, typified a broader cosmopolitan humanity. True, this was rather the achievement of individuals and cannot be characterized as the mission of the people in general. Nevertheless the fact remains that the Jew excelled everywhere by his zeal for truth, his love of knowledge and wisdom and, owing to his religious fervor, his study of the Torah to which he was trained from childhood up, he became actually the instructor of an illiterate environment.

But above all, he remained ever-conscious of the mission assigned to Israel as 'a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.' He led a consecrated life. In the midst of a world full of profanity and vulgarity, of coarse sensuality and drunkenness he displayed the virtues of chastity and modesty in his domestic and social sphere. His whole being was amidst all temptations and tempests of life anchored upon loyalty. The Law extending over all phases and functions of life disciplined him to render him sober and earnest, a veritable priest among the nations, however little recognized as such. Each Jew was a living protest against the dogmas of the Church which placed a man born of woman on God's throne, and defied human reason in order

to save the soul. He was God's priest and prophet pointing to a better day, to God's Kingdom on earth.

With the downfall of the ghetto walls the relation of the Jew to the surrounding world changed, and no less so his whole aspect and mode of life. Emancipation made him a citizen in all the Western lands and placed before him the alternative of loyalty to all the laws and customs of his national past or of unreserved acceptance of the mandates of his newly acquired citizenship. It was a severe crisis he had to go through. Amidst the changed social conditions the Law upon which his life and his faith had so securely rested all these centuries, lost its hold upon him, however tenaciously the few still clung to it. To this outward cause there came the spirit of progress, of historical investigation and, above all, the general secular education with its appeal to reason and common sense, which undermined his traditional belief and his loyalty to a glorious past. He no longer could conscientiously pray and hope for the restitution of the sacrificial cult in the Temple at Jerusalem, nor for the restoration of the state to be fashioned again after the Mosaic Law. The whole of Judaism seemed to be swept away by the on-rushing tide of new ideas. But there, amidst the despondency, which had seized upon the faithful, and the apostasy which spread to an alarming degree among the would-be enlightened, the Reform leaders stepped in to check the evil by translating Israel's past, its literature and history, in the light of the new spirit of historical investigation. With a deeper insight into the prophetic writings and the Agadic or philosophical utterances of sages, they laid all the stress on the eternal verities, the essentials of Judaism which remained the same amidst the ever-changing conditions.

This led them to bring the mission of Israel, thus long obscured and ignored amidst the legalistic view of mediaeval Judaism, into the foreground,⁷ and to illumine the path, the life task and duty of the Jew in distinction to other religious sects. Nor must it be said, as we are so frequently told, that the doctrines of Judaism, such as its pure monotheism, its concept of man as the son of God, its cosmic Unity which has no place for a Satanic power of evil, or its ethical

principle of holiness which includes all of life and demands disinterestness in the doing of good and the shunning of evil, that all these are only for the theologian, the man in the pulpit to proclaim and defend, but not within the scope of the people at large. The average Jew still shows that he stands forth steadfast through the ages, as 'the witness' to the Unity of God as the Father of all and to the one undivided humanity in the coming Kingdom of God. Moreover, liberal Christianity has fully come to the recognition of what the steadfast loyalty of the Jew to his sublime faith throughout the lands and the ages has done for the world. Never before was the outside world so eager and willing to listen to the views of progressive Judaism and to accept its doctrines as it is today. What Dr. Wise is reported to have said in his intimate circle to the effect that within fifty years Judaism's teachings will have become the common property of the American people seems to come more and more within the possibility of realization. Amidst the stimulating intermingling of ideas and exchange of thought in press, platform and pulpit, amidst the general enlightenment through education and the open forum of discussion which works for progress, liberty and democracy, the narrow ecclesiastical systems of belief and absolute forms of religious practice are discarded. Orthodoxy in all creeds is fast dwindling away and melting like the snow before the sun of spring. A wonderful transformation is taking place in the various Churches. The cry for reconstruction is heard everywhere. People crave for unity, for a faith which unites Protestant, Catholic and Jew, nay, even Mohammedan and Hindoo Theists in a God who is the Father of all and hears the prayers of all, for a God in whom all find refuge in trouble, comfort and strength in hours of trial and death, a God who is the deepest and holiest experience of the human soul. Is this not the God of the Bible, of patriarch and prophet, the God sought and yearned for by the first man and looked up to in aspiration and adoration by the last, the God of History, revealed to humanity by the religious genius of the Jew? But then we are confronted with the question: What are your credentials as a missionary people today? We certainly do not, nor should we, aim at convert-

ing the non-Jew. Ever since R. Joshua ben Chananiah uttered the beautiful words: "The righteous of all nations shall have a share in the world of eternal bliss," our maxim has been Conviction, not Conversion; Conduct, not Confession; Deed, not Creed. But who will deny that the Jew who suffered so much for the truth has still that passion and zeal for the truth which cannot remain indifferent to what others think and take as the great verities of life. His must still be that deep conviction which works like a wholesome contagion upon others. His incomparable history and literature must have endowed him with that religious experience and religious devotion which would for all time render him the trusted guardian and acknowledged defender of Israel's heritage. And if the average Jew today knows so little of the great treasures deposited in our matchless literature, and lacks all acquaintance with the names and deeds of our heroes and martyrs, our thinkers and poets, with our unique history of the ages, so as no longer to burn with the desire to make his God the banner of truth to rally all men around, the fault lies with our education, not with the mission idea of Judaism. As a matter of fact, the modern time requires modern methods of reading the Scripture and the entire religious literature of both Judaism and Christianity. Israel's monotheistic truth has not come ready-made from heaven, nor from the brain of law-giver and prophet to be accepted in blind belief. It is the product of a long process of growth, ever ripening and expanding with the ages, the outgrowth of the religious genius of the Jew which was still to some extent working in the founders of the Church. Presented in this light of historic development as the ripest fruit of the Jewish spirit at each epoch, the Jewish truth cannot but arouse new love and zeal in the new generation, to make all zealous defenders and champions of a religion whose spirit is perennial, as the God to which it testifies is eternal. And should this mission of the Jew for his only God cease at the very time when the world needs him most, and is actually waiting for him to present the truth of our seers and sages in its immaculate purity, cleansed from the alloys which depreciated its value in the eyes of all thinking people? Yet only in living and working

in and with the world for his Only God can he achieve this mission.

And there is the other insistent cry of the age: Religion must be *life*, a life of *service*, not self-seeking solicitude for happiness, either here or hereafter. The all-comprehensive, all uplifting watchword of our time is social service, the working together of all forces for righteousness, for the readjustment of all relations between high and low, rich and poor, between the strong and the weak, between labor and capital, between the wise and the simple. And this grand principle is being extended today beyond the life of communities to the entire human family, to all the nations of the globe, to unify them in the endeavor to establish righteousness and liberty, peace and concord everywhere and secure the protection of the small and the feeble by the big and the strong among the nations. But again we ask, where and by whom was this principle of life, this golden rule of ethics most emphatically voiced from the beginning, and rendered the hope and the goal of humanity, if not by our great prophets of yore? And who has suffered and fought persistently and confidently throughout the ages for this glorious boon of liberty and justice as did the Jew, in whose innermost being this dynamic force still lives as a fire never to be quenched? Yes, the Jew is still the God-appointed champion of freedom and righteousness, the world's missionary of justice and liberty, all the more as he is still to battle and to suffer for them like no other class of people. And with such unparalleled experience as the Jew has had throughout the centuries, and in the face of the world's attitude today towards our prophetic teaching, will he dare think first and last only of his own political security, instead of realizing that, as 'the Lord's Servant' his life must above all, as heretofore, be one of service for the entire human race? To help in the redemption of the world by righteousness is his Messianic mission. Nor is it sufficient to claim the title of priority for this principle of social justice. He must substantiate his mission by its practice in so large a measure as to become from a mere materialistic pursuer of wealth, which he is often declared to be, the very banner-bearer of idealism to command the world's admira-

tion and emulation. How did Abraham win souls for his God? the rabbis ask, and they answer, By taking all his possessions as having been entrusted to his stewardship, and thus devoting his life to the service of God by his philanthropic work. So is the Deuteronomic verse: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," interpreted in the ancient Midrash (Sifre Deut. 32ff) to mean: "Thou shalt make thy God to be beloved by all thy fellow-creatures through deeds of love as did Abraham" לְכָל הַבְּרִיּוֹת כְּאַבְרָהָם אֲהַבְהוּ. The Jew's obligation and responsibility is accordingly a twofold one. He must take care of his own co-religionists, and at the same time 'hallow the name of his God by promoting social justice in the ever-widening circles of humanity.'

But there is a third point in Israel's mission which must not be treated lightly, either. We have been appointed in our Sinai constitution as 'a kingdom of priests and a holy nation,' and, therefore, many laws were imposed upon us intended to distinguish us from the rest of mankind. Such laws were the laws of diet and dress and of levitical purity, which only the priestly castes had to observe elsewhere. They were gradually dropped by the modern Jew, not from frivolity, nor even for mere convenience, but in consequence of his closer contact with the surrounding world, from which he could, or should, not forever keep aloof, if he was to win it for his truths. Whether the Palestinian Jew will again observe them when there is no cause for discarding them, is a question which does not concern us. At all events the spirit of these priestly laws expressive of Israel's sanctity, should be maintained to render him the model and exemplar of life's holiness. There is above all the sanctity of the home, of marriage, of the relation to sex in which the Jew at all times excelled, and which wrested from the heathen seer of yore the exclamation: "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, thy dwellings, O Israel!" (Num. XXIV, 5). This ought to cause each Jew and Jewess still to stand out as priest and priestess at the domestic shrine, to present to the world around him patterns of purity and chastity. It is not enough to avert from our children the danger of sinking to a lower level amidst the many allurements of the environ-

ment. The Jew today should, in realization of his priestly mission, be foremost in endeavoring to lift the generation from the mire of coarse sensuality with which the so-called social evil with its concomitant free love and other modes of licentiousness threatens to engulf it, and invest the bonds of marriage and the home with the highest possible sacredness binding for all classes of men. Let it be understood that just as in summing up Jewish ethics in the three words: "Only to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thy God" the prophet addresses not Israel, but *man*: "It has been told thee, O man, what is good" (Micah IV, 8), so does the Law, in giving the divine ordinances regarding marriage, refer not to Israel only, but to man, saying: "Mine ordinances which, if a man do, he shall live by them" (Lev. XVIII, 5; comp. Sifra to the passage).

But holiness in the Jewish concept comprises much more. There is nothing so common or profane in all of life's functions that should not be hallowed by religion. "The bells of the horses shall bear the imprint: 'Holy unto the Lord,'" says the prophet (Zech. XIV, 20). This is Jewish spirituality. Not a view to the world to come, but this world with all it offers and contains should be comprised by the idea of God's Kingdom.

How can we account for the strange fact that the lofty teachings of him whose birth in the gospel story is hailed as the harbinger of 'peace and good will among men on earth;' that the high ideals voiced in the Sermon on the Mount, so full of sympathy with suffering humanity, should have brought about discord and strife, hatred and persecution rather than harmony and peace among men and nations? The declaration: "My kingdom is not of this world," gave the whole earthly life a false valuation and direction. State and society, industry, culture and science were henceforth looked upon with contempt, as people hungered only after heavenly salvation and bliss. And when at last this whole system of threats and bribes, of Hell and Heaven, of a world punishment and reward beyond the grave, broke down in our day, the deluge of sin, of crime and vice, of corruption and depravity from which we suffer today came, and our entire civilization was plunged into a state of

barbarism and savagery beyond description. Man needs a higher and deeper ethical motive, and only a religion which makes *holiness* the aim of the soul instead of *salvation*; only a system of faith which teaches men to be good, because it is good and godly, and to shun evil, because it is evil and ungodly; only disinterested service of God and man emanating from the principle of life's holiness will lead mankind back to virtue, righteousness and peace. This is Judaism's teaching, whose kingdom of God is to be built by man here on earth.

But there is another important viewpoint which must be set forth in all its clearness as being essential to Israel's mission. It is the forward-looking attitude, the real Messianic element of progressive Judaism. The allegation frequently made that Judaism stood still for the last nineteen hundred years is far more true of the Christian Church. For her all the Messianic prophecies have been fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, who is looked upon as the highest possible type of human perfection. Yet this retrospective attitude is contrary to our very idea of historical progress, to the principle of evolution. Judaism through the various periods of history has been growing and expanding philosophically and ethically, and its Messiah has ever been looked for as coming to realize the prophetic dreams and visions. True, Orthodoxy awaits a Messiah from the house of David to come and restore the Temple and State of Judea in accordance with the Mosaic Code, and is therefore backward-looking instead of favoring progress and accepting the principle of evolution. As the stars in heaven are moved along their heavenly track by both a centrifugal and centripetal force, so Judaism seems to require the centripetal force of conservatism, lest the centrifugal force of progress and reform sweep it off its historic path. This accounts for Orthodoxy, and as genuine Orthodoxy could not withstand the disintegrating force of the new age, it has now made a common cause with Zionism. The prophetic outlook and forward-pressing force of Reform Judaism, however, points insistently to the Messianic goal which gives it universal character, as voiced in our pulpits and our prayers. But then it should not be confined to the synagogue. It should

go out and challenge the non-Jewish world. Too long have we remained on the defensive. We must become aggressive in asserting our birthright. Too long have we been misunderstood and misjudged. Lectures and tracts are not sufficient. We need an extensive popular literature for general enlightenment. Let the world learn our view of Christianity and its founder. Let the New Testament teachings be shown in the true light of historical development, and the so-called Christian civilization presented from the Jewish point of view. We need not, and should not, belittle or depreciate any creed or rite, but we should by all means dissipate the erroneous notions concerning the Jew and Judaism prevalent among the masses, and set forth in impressive and lucid form the virtues of loyalty to country and home ever fostered and the intellectual and moral forces engendered by the teaching and training the Jew received in all the lands and ages. The cry for the Reconstruction of humanity stirs all hearts today. A new heaven and a new earth are the prophetic promises of our statesmen and seers. Who can be in closer sympathy with the stupendous plan of a world peace built on justice and liberty, in which the leaders of the nations are engaged in these days, than is the descendant of the prophets and psalmists, the Jew whose scriptural truths built up the American Republic, and whose prophetic dreams and visions of yore are made the sponsors of a new humanity today? Decades, nay, centuries may pass before the lofty ideals will have become a reality; but we have learned to wait. Not for a Zion which is within easy reach, which is purchased and made a matter of diplomatic bargaining. Zion has for us a spiritual meaning. It is the symbol of a united humanity, of the realization of mankind's highest ideal at the end of time.⁸

Let Palestine, our ancient home, under the protection of the great nations, or under specific British suzerainty, again become a center of Jewish culture and a safe refuge to the homeless. We shall all welcome it and aid in the promotion of the work. Let the million or more of Jewish citizens dwelling there amidst the large Christian and Mohammedan population attached to their own sacred spots, be empowered

and encouraged to build up a commonwealth broad and liberal in spirit to serve as a school for international and interdenominational humanity. We shall all hail the undertaking and pray for its prosperity. The historic task of the Jew is not to be, and cannot be, accomplished therewith. This would never be the solution of the great enigma of Jewish history, nor a satisfactory end to the awful tragedy. Call Israel, as did Judah ha Levi, the great lover of Zion, the heart of mankind whose life sap was to flow through the arteries of the nations, or compare it, as was repeatedly done, to the Gulf Stream, whose warm currents run through the ocean to calm its wild waves, the Jew will ever remain an international force influencing the world, as it has been influenced by it on its course through the lands and the ages. His place is *not* among the *League of Nations*, but among the *League of Religions*, as already indicated by the last of the prophets when he says: "From the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, My name is great among the nations . . . saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. I, 11).

Of course, before going outside for this missionary activity, we must begin within our own circle, and in concert with all our brethren, conservative or progressive, endeavor to make the modern Jew again a zealous lover of the Torah. We must first regenerate our own people before attempting to regenerate the world—קשׁוּט עִצְמֶךָ וְאַחֵר כִּךְ קִשׁוּט אֲחֵרִים. Moreover, in hearty cooperation with all liberal and liberalizing forces around us, we should strive to broaden as well as deepen, to elevate as well as humanize religion so as to make it everywhere the high road to the great Temple of humanity, 'the house of prayer for all nations.'

Not in haste, nor running the risk of being lost on the way shall we perform our mission among the Gentile world, but with due regard to our sacred heritage and our character as the priest people. "For ye shall not go out in haste, neither shall ye go by flight, for the Lord will go before you and the Lord of Israel will be your rearward" (Isa. LII, 12). Not a Church Universal, nor a uniform religion for all, but the divine truth reflected in many systems of belief and thought, just as the diamond reflects light by

its many facets, a religion ever progressive on lines of historical continuity, but never finished or final, leading all the nations and classes of men to the mountain of God—this is Judaism's aim, the realization of our Messianic hope, the establishment of God's kingdom on earth.

Yet at no time and in no country has the opportunity come to the Jew to again mount the watchtower of prophecy, and in working out his mission to unfold the banner of the highest idealism for all humanity as at the present great turning-point in the world's history, and in America, to whom a disrupted and disjointed world looks to be reset on the firm and lasting foundations of justice, liberty and peace.

BACKWARD OR FORWARD?

FIRST DISCOURSE

"It is neither the voice of them that shout for victory, nor the voice of them that cry for being defeated, but the noise of vociferation do I hear."—Exod. XXXII, 18.

THE confirmation solemnities being over, and the Sabbath schools having finished their work for the season, what attraction can the pulpit offer to a fastidious audience that craves for dainties in place of wholesome food? Shall I speak on the new Bible translation? How many Jews to-day care to read the Bible, or take interest in that piece of antiquity? There is a novelty offered to our New York Jews in the appearance of a new rabbi of renown who, with laudable courage and independence, gives free utterance to his rigid conservatism, boldly challenging Reform Judaism by the open declaration, that he who disowns the statutes and ordinances of Mosaico-Rabbinical Judaism on principle has forfeited the name of Jew. Of course, the novelty of the learned speaker's notions and attitude creates a stir and a welcome sensation throughout the Jewish circles of New York, and an opinion about the influence to be exercised by the new rabbi, for whom I cherish the highest regard, both as an eminent scholar and as a most sincere and earnest advocate of conservative Judaism, would be rather premature. Personally, I gladly and heartily wish him the greatest success, and I have little doubt that, being supported and encouraged by our *exclusively* conservative local press, he will exercise a wholesome influence upon the consolidation and the right coalition of the different elements of our congregations, which are at present too often brought together without unity of purpose and principle.

But the gauntlet thrown into our face must be taken up at once, and I to-day simply propose to ask the question: Are

we progressing, or ought we to retrograde? Has Reform Judaism come upon a sand bank, so that we require Talmudical orthodoxy to set us afloat again, or are we still strong enough to stand at the helm and steer American Judaism towards its lofty goal?

Mark well. Mere cant and bombastic phraseology will do us no good. Gibes and sneers cast at orthodoxy or at reform by opponents will not solve the question. Even our much-vaunted progress is far from being an undisputable fact. History has its constant ups and downs, its luminous and its dark epochs. Upon every exertion and exhaustion of the intellect follows a reaction of the heart. Periods of rationalism give way to periods of mysticism and dark superstition. Upon the sunny days of Jewish learning and independent research in Spain came the frantic vagaries of the Cabbala. Maimonides' name was beclouded by the holy Zohar and Rabbi Isaac Luria. And, indeed, he who knows how to read the signs of the time may, without being a Daniel, well foretell the coming reaction, which may render the twentieth century less intellectual than ours. There is even in our midst an increasing shallowness of thought visible everywhere, whilst the emotional is pressing forward to take the lead. Still the question of the hour is: Retrogression or progress? Must we, after having dropped the obsolete observances of by-gone days, after having worked for thirty five years in this country for emancipation from the yoke of Mosaico-Talmudical Judaism, again bend our neck to wear it in order to be complete Jews in the sense of orthodoxy, or may we persist in claiming, as we did thus far, to stand on a far higher ground, whilst discarding a great many of the ceremonial laws of the Bible and tradition, and placing ourselves on the standpoint of prophetic Judaism, with the Messianic aim as its world-embracing goal?

Mosaico-Rabbinical Judaism is retrospective. It has not the courage to stand on its feet. It subsists on the merits of our forefathers זכות אבות. Its very ritual, its whole mode of worship, it considers only as a feeble substitute for the temple sacrifice. It longs for the restoration of temple and state in Judea, hoping for the restitution of the entire Mosaic system of social, political and religious life. It

clings to the maxim: "If we are common men, our ancestors were angels; and if they were but common men, we must rank among the brutes." Reform Judaism, on the contrary, looks forward with hope for a far brighter future, beholding in the Messiah the ideal of mankind to be realized by the Jewish people through all the factors and agencies of civilization and progress, and in the temple on Zion's hills the house of prayer to be opened on all spots of the globe for all nations to worship the Most High as the Father of all men. Its golden era lies not behind, but before us. Which of the two views then is more in congruity with the drift and spirit of our age and of all ages of human history? Which are we to espouse? The one that turns the dials of the time backward, or the one that proudly points to the forward move of history? The one that wails over the ruins of the past, over the decay of ritualistic religion, over the downfall of creeds and blind authority-worship, or the one that hails the rising faith in all that is divine in man, the building up of a religion which already our prophets of yore proclaimed to be as broad as man and as wide as the globe?

The question is, in fact, a threefold one: Can we, or must we, believe exactly what our fathers believed concerning Revelation and the Law, Resurrection and the Messianic future? Must we, or can we, believe that the tablets of the covenant were expressly made, and the Ten Words engraved on them by the very hand of God, because the Bible says so? Can we, or must we, believe that all the laws and narratives given in the books of Moses have been dictated to the very letter by God? Suppose we have, by tracing the origin of all the Biblical narratives about the primeval ages, received the strong impression or gained the firm conviction that they are but traditions and legends transmitted by men of primitive culture. Or suppose we have, by closely examining all these laws attributed to God, found them to contain many traces of rude barbarism, which our reverential love of God forbids us to ascribe to Him as author. Ought we on this account no longer consider ourselves as standing within the pale of Judaism? No. I do not believe that the Mosaic statutes about the sacrifices, the incense, and the priestly apparel, or the sanitary and criminal laws, are

unchangeable ordinances of God dictated from heaven. I distinguish in the Bible the kernel from the husk, the grain from the chaff, the spirit from the temporary form. Just as the infant requires a different kind of nourishment than the grown man, so the Bible, as the revelation offered to an uncouth and uncivilized age, contains another pabulum for the soul than what is demanded by a cultured age. Having outgrown the guiding-strings and swaddling-clothes of infancy, man to-day, with his self-consciousness, wants to walk on his own feet. Must I, then, because I cannot accept the traditional beliefs—take, for instance, only the belief in the resurrection of the body, the only immortality belief Mosaico-Talmudical Judaism owns and offers—renounce Judaism because one rabbi, or five hundred orthodox rabbis, say so? Since when is it a Jewish maxim: “Happy are the poor in intellect, for to them belongs the kingdom of heaven?” Nay, let me ask in good faith: Is it advisable, in the light of modern enlightenment and progress, to check and suppress free thought and research in Judaism, and leave it to non-Jewish pulpits to preach a faith as broad and as bright as the heavens? Shall the intelligent and thinking class of Jews henceforth go to a free Christian church, there to hear the truth hitherto preached from every Jewish reform pulpit all over the land: that reason is the light of God in the soul of man; that there is no contradiction between God’s revelation in nature and God’s revelation in the law of man’s conduct; that divine revelation is not a matter of the past, no absolute and complete system, but a constant unfolding of truth and knowledge, ever to grow in breadth, and depth, and width, until the earth is full of knowledge of God, as the waters cover the sea? No. The Jew, having in the very night of mediaeval darkness been trained by his Maimonideses and Gersonideses to think, shall not go back and stop thinking in the bright daylight of intellectual culture.

The next question is: Must we, or can we, observe the ordinances and statutes bequeathed to us by Mosaico-Rabbinical Judaism? Must we, in order to be real Jews, keep all the *rites and ceremonies* prescribed by law and tradition? Let us consider one moment: What is the entire

Mosaic law? Without inquiring into its origin and history, without even pronouncing an opinion about the time when it was first introduced as foundation of Jewish religion and national life, it was certainly intended and given for the purpose of fashioning and training the Jewish people for its high mission as a people of God in the midst of an idolatrous world, prone to most cruel vices and abominable superstitions. It was a system of education fit for a still childish and semi-barbarous nation in an age of rude barbarism and unmitigated polytheism. This alone explains the attitude of Mosaism towards slavery, polygamy, retaliation and bloody penalties, the cruelty of which it endeavored to assuage. All these laws, however, Rabbinical Judaism, at the downfall of temple and State, transformed into walls of a fortress or a citadel around the Jews, to shield them during the exile against absorption in the multitude of nations. Seclusion and distinction became the prominent feature of every Jewish rite. To look for other reasons was deemed superfluous, if not sinful. Take, for instance, the law forbidding the wearing of garments woven together of wool and linen. It undoubtedly was, like so many other ordinances, instituted as a safeguard against a heathen practice connected with the lascivious Canaanite worship of Baal and Astarte. In the rabbinical system it became a divine ordinance, which must be obeyed without asking for the reason. The same is the case with all the ritual and, particularly, the dietary laws of Moses. Our latter-day representatives of conservatism fail to see that they deviate from both Rabbinical and Biblical Judaism in trying to find *sanitary* provisions in the prohibition of things declared as *unclean* for Jews as a *holy* people.

So are four kinds of plants ordained in the Law as symbols of gratitude, to be carried in solemn procession on the harvest-booth festival before God. What they were, we do not know exactly. Rabbinical Judaism has fixed form and names of these for all times and climates, no matter whether they are products of the land or not. In like manner, tradition has fixed form and standard for every religious practice, for every step of life, without regard to fitness of time and surroundings. Out of one single Biblical ordinance,

Rabbinical Judaism has brought forth hundreds of such, and being derived from the very mouth of God and transmitted from Moses on Sinai to the succeeding teachers, an alteration or abolition is out of question. Of course, that which comes from God can neither be reformed nor improved. Beyond the law of God progress is an impossibility. Consequently all conservative Jews cling tenaciously to every law and tradition of the past, denying the very title of Jew to any one who deviates on principle. But, as reform or enlightened Jews, we humbly ask: Can we, or ought we to observe all those obsolete and meaningless practices of the past, or should we not rather replace them by forms more adequate to the age, more expressive of, and impressive with, the awe of holiness? Is Judaism to be only a sacred mummy, or a fountain of life? Is it a bucketful of stale water carried along from the Sinai wilderness, or a perennial spring flowing down from the rock at the bidding of the Moses-staff, still lifted by all those who as heralds voice the religious consciousness of the age? Must we still be cowed down by fear of the thunders on Sinai and obey the law as slaves yoked to the letter, or may we discard the very idea of religion being a mere *legality*, and, like any of the prophets, mount the hilltop of God in the proud consciousness that we are sons of God, and that God reveals Himself to us in as loud and as distinct words of admonition and guidance as He did to our fathers of yore?

And, finally, can we, or must we, expect, with Rabbinical Judaism, to have the bloody sacrifices as the only mode of worship, the cruel dealing with idolaters and criminals as the only way of meting out justice, the entire Jewish State, with its temple and priesthood, restored? Or may we believe that, as the Mosaic law has been substituted by Rabbinism, so will Rabbinism be replaced by a higher and purer shape of religion; that, as from the flames which swallowed up the temple, Judaism has risen, phoenix-like, to a loftier and more spiritual form, so, from the very ruins of Ghetto-Judaism, will the foundation be laid to a temple of God spacious enough to embrace all sects and races, and rally them around the uplifted banner of the One God? Our reform movement may have, and indeed has, committed mistakes, which I

shall point out in another lecture. We have been altogether too hasty in discarding the old, while anticipating the new. But back to Judea, back to the Ghetto we shall not go. It may be, and I doubt it not for a moment, that those who yet sincerely cling to the old views and practices are much happier and more satisfied with their fixed standard of religion than we are to-day in our transitory state. But having once eaten of the forbidden fruits of universal knowledge, seeing the golden gates of Paradisiacal childhood irrevocably shut behind us, shall we be also driven out of the gates of Judaism, because we cannot accept and recognize its Mosaico-Rabbinical tenets as our own? No. We are honest enough to confess that we do not believe in the authority of the letter and of tradition, and yet claim to be as true, as sincere, as fervent and whole-souled Jews as any; nay, we claim to hold the ground on which our great seers stood when predicting the triumph of Israel's truth.

Freedom, says the Midrash, חרות על הלוואות אל תקרי חרות, חרות אלא חרות was the word engraved with letters of fire upon the tablets of the Law. Yes; freedom from the bondage of the letter, freedom from the yoke of mere *legality*, freedom from blind authority-belief; freedom for all the neglected and excluded; freedom for woman, whom Mosaico-Rabbinical Judaism deprived of her divine rights and privileges as child of God by placing her on a level with the slave and the imbecile; freedom from all restrictions which curb the minds and encroach upon the hearts in their craving for all that is beautiful, good, and true, and because truly human, also divine; freedom from all fences and hedges which prevent the unfolding of the full truth; freedom from all rust and mould of the past, which disfigure and obscure our bright heritage before the world and check its wholesome growth—this is what we demand and insist on as upholders of the Law. Well, then, backwards or forwards? This is the issue. Certainly with the deepest gratitude and piety we look backward upon what both Mosaic and Rabbinical Judaism have accomplished, upon what they have done for the world, and what they have so wonderfully achieved for us. But in gazing backward, our mental eye discerns Mount Zion towering high above Mount Sinai. On its

pinnacle no thunder is heard, no fire, no cloud, no smoke is seen. The prophets alone, and among them the greatest of prophets, utter truths which will never perish; the psalmist sings forth in strains which never die away. And around it the nations are gathered to listen to God's anointed, Israel, the priest, and martyr, with him in unison to bow before the Most High in truth, while building the kingdom of justice, of love, and of peace, which blends heaven with earth, the human with the divine. For this kingdom we work, we hope, we live. Amen.

FORM OR SPIRIT

SECOND DISCOURSE

"And Nadab and Abihu, sons of Aaron, took each of them his censer, and put fire therein, and laid incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which He had not commanded them. And there came forth fire from before the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. Then Moses said to Aaron: This is it that the Lord spake, saying: I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me."—Leviticus X, 1-3.

OUR text relates the sad fate of priests who brought strange fire upon the sacred altar of God. We are all warned by this lesson to be on our guard, whenever matters of religion are at stake. We must beware of the lurid fire of fanaticism and intolerance, and no less of the strange, unholy zest of selfishness and quarrelsomeness. To keep and cherish the sacred flame of religious devotion undefiled by any profane fire of passion, is the duty of all of us.

Far be it from me to allow impure, selfish motives to enter into the present debate between Reform and Orthodoxy.

"A controversy started for the sake of God and truth will always be of lasting good; a controversy entered into with selfish motives will end in ridicule."

Reform Judaism has been challenged by the declaration,

recently made from a neighboring Jewish pulpit, that 'a reform which seeks to progress without the Mosaico-Rabbinical tradition is a deformity; that he who turns away on principle from the standpoint of the validity of Mosaico-Rabbinical tradition, such a one has banished himself from the camp of Israel, writes his own epitaph, "I am no Jew, no adherent to the faith of my fathers," has ceased to be a Jew, and is a Karaite.' This is as much as to say that Geiger, Einhorn, Holdheim, Aub, Stein and Wechsler, or the still living pioneers of Reform, S. Hirsch, Philippson, and S. Adler, and all of us, their pupils and followers, with the ten thousands of Jews in Europe and the great majority of Jews in this country who have Reform inscribed on their banner, are with one stroke of the pen to be deprived of the title of Jews, because they cannot on principle recognize the validity of the Law and tradition. In vain then did Dr. Geiger labor for forty years in the Old, and Dr. Einhorn, I. M. Wise and others in the New World for the triumph of the Reform principle, which declares that the entire Mosaic system of laws, with its Levitical, ceremonial and prohibitory ritual statutes, was applicable only to by-gone ages prone to idolatry and vice, only the moral statutes being unchangeable and perpetual; that the so-called Rabbinical tradition was itself a reform, instituted by the Pharisean rabbis in contradiction to the letter-worship of the Sadducees, the original Karaites, and that, while Talmudical Judaism was good enough as a wall of seclusion and protection for the Jew in the gloomy Ghetto, the Jew in the midst of modern civilization demands different forms of religion, more expressive of the grand, world-redeeming truths Judaism is to represent and to teach.

All respect and honor to the man who conscientiously adheres to every minute ordinance of the Talmud! All reverence for our great and glorious past which has produced a race of heroes and martyrs which forms the wonder of history! I can fully sympathize with the rabbi whom love and piety prompt to spare no effort in trying to uphold this past in the face of modern progress and enlightenment. But in the name of hundreds of thousands of Jews who no longer believe in the divine origin of the entire

Mosaic law and its Rabbinical superstructure; in the name of all those who are honest enough to say: "I avoid everything unclean, but I do not think that to eat oysters or pork is a sin that can in any way compare with lying or cheating," or "I believe in the Sabbath as a law of God, but I do not accept any of its minute and often cruel Mosaico-Rabbinical applications;" in the name of those Jews who believe in the divine working of the spirit of God upon and through men, but in no supernatural revelation, I claim the name of Jew for all who, while standing on the platform of reform or enlightened Judaism, discard on principle all ritualism of the past and seek for better and more adequate forms of religious devotion and life.

For what is Judaism but the law of life, a living truth, a tree of life rooted and growing in the hearts of men? We may as well think of stilling our thirst with the stale water of the stagnant pool, or of inhaling the air stored up for centuries in the earth, as feed our souls on spiritual food prepared for remote ages. Men grow, and so must ideas and religious truths. Judaism entered the world's arena with a protest against the dead gods of the heathen world, while asserting its God to be the God of life. Yet God, in order to redeem us, in order to comfort us in time of trouble and loss, in order to strengthen us against trials and temptations, must be a *living God*, not a God who created the world some 6,000 years ago, resting ever since; not a God who revealed His will some 3,100 years ago, keeping silent ever since, but a God who still works incessantly in the workshop of Nature, a God who still reveals His law in the vast creation and in the conscience of man, a God who lives in us, who in more or less distinct sounds and signs speaks to all men and ages; a God who has eternities at His command, by whose magnetic force all souls are attracted, following His law of freedom as the water drops of the ocean follow the gravity of moon and sun. Judaism is a *living faith*, not a religion confined to dead letters, to a scarcely readable parchment scroll, but one which forms the vital spark of all moral action and conduct, which prompts us to worship and perceive God, not in dead forms, in rites of by-gone ages, in signs hardly intelligible, but in living truths and forms,

expressive of life and truth. And as life manifests its power in attracting and absorbing all that nourishes strength, and in rejecting all that is obnoxious and burdensome, so religion shows its vitality in constant change and reform. Mosaism was built on views and rites adequate to the age, when Israel grew into a nation, of materials furnished in those times. Rabbinical Judaism again made use of what later ages and civilizations offered in the shape of opinions and forms. And so are we to-day anxious to find appropriate and impressive forms for what is the living Judaism of our age.

My esteemed opponent, in a conversation I had with him on the pending issues, said to me after having heard me speak in the manner I do here: "You are only an ethical Jew!"—Why, all our great prophets were but ethical Jews. None of them insisted,—or represented Abraham or any pious and good Israelite as such who had to insist,—on the observance of the Mosaic ceremonial laws! And this prophetic ground we wish to hold, believing only thus to work out our mission as priests of One God in the midst of the modern world.

Inquiring into the chief cause of the present decay of religious fervor and earnestness, we find it to be the awakening of a man to self-consciousness. He disdains to bend his neck to a yoke imposed upon him by uncultured ages of the past, whether it consists of creeds which shackle and cripple his reason; or of statutes and prohibitions which enchain and imprison his body. The Jew was in so far more fortunate than his Christian brother in that he had his intellect unfettered. He was allowed free research, he only had to submit to the legal restrictions of the Mosaic-Rabbinical system. Of course, he did not mind this wall of seclusion as long as he remained shut up within the Jewish Ghetto. Yet no sooner did he inhale the invigorating air of liberty and modern civilization, particularly in our own free country, than he craved for an untrammelled intercourse with the Gentile world. He longed for recognition as fellow-citizen. He did not wish to appear as a foreigner, as an Oriental, not even in his own house of worship. For this reason, Reform was welcomed and hailed, not only as an emancipator from the yoke of dead ritualism,

but also as a safeguard and victory-boding banner to rally all the enlightened and progressive Jews who otherwise threatened to leave Israel's camp. For Reform, with the voice of Ezekiel, said to the spirit: "Come and blow upon the dry bones of Judaism and infuse new life into it." Pointing to the eternal truth of the law, of the prophets and the psalmists, it predicted a new epoch for Israel of modern civilization, saying: The divine power which created Mosaism and Rabbinism will provide another form for Judaism, destined, in conjunction with its two daughters, Christianity and Islamism, to bring about the Messianic era of humanity.

Reform Judaism has exercised a mighty influence upon modern Israel. Ritualism is not altogether dead, but what conservative rabbi to-day dares give utterance to the old Talmudical maxim that to eat a piece of unclean meat is a greater crime than to cheat, because subject to severer punishment? As in the most orthodox church, so there is but one voice heard to-day from the most conservative and the most radical Jewish pulpit concerning morality and humanity ranking high above every ritualistic law and ordinance. This is the victory of prophetism over church dogmatism and synagogue ceremonialism. If in any, in this most essential point we have made great headway in religion. But also in regard to modern innovations one synagogue after the other has thus far followed the van of reform. Every organ that is played in the Jewish synagogue, every woman that sings in the choir or joins in the prayers of the congregation from her pew, every confirmation solemnity introduced, every exchange of Occidental features for Oriental ones, is an inroad upon Rabbinical Judaism and a victory of Reform.

That Reform has not made good all its promises, that it has failed to realize many of its expectations, I do not hesitate to admit. Its great shortcomings consist in its neglect of domestic devotion, in its constant appeal to reason instead of cultivating sentiment. Reform abolished the old regular services, the Hebrew daily prayers, but did not train our children to communicate with their God in fervent devotion at the beginning and close of each day. It did

away with old formulas of praise and benediction, but failed to imbue every step or enjoyment of the Jew with religious life. It allowed the old fires of self-consecration, of sanctification of human life at its various solemn epochs to cool down. Still who knows who is to blame? There is little more piety and devotion manifested in conservative circles. The Sabbath is in no way better observed among the conservative than among the Reform Jews.

We certainly need and pray for a spirit of conservatism which holds its protecting wings over our time-honored and sacred legacy. But we shall never preserve Judaism from decay by galvanizing dead forms, by instituting rites and views which collide with modern civilization and prevent us from having free intercourse with a world which we are to win for the idea of the One God and the One Humanity. No. We want a broad, enlightened and cosmopolitan Judaism. We want a Judaism which appeals to the heart as well as to reason. We want a religious education which again renders each Jewish household a sanctuary of piety and devotion, of purity and virtue. We want religious forms which stamp our souls with the seal of religious freedom, rendering us true children of God, and not with the seal of cruel bondage to make of us blind slaves of the letter of the Law.

We want a Judaism congenial to the free soil of America. We want progress and enlightenment, and shall not rest until we have divested Judaism of all its disfiguring rites and placed it on that height on which we may hope we shall one day feel the brotherly grasp of all those who gladly inscribe their names unto the Only One of Israel, because they have felt and seen that God is with us.

The tablets of the laws written by the hand of man—says the Midrash—have been broken, but when once God Himself will write His law upon the tablets of the hearts of men, no earthly or superhuman power will again break that covenant, for divine truth or love is then written with indelible letters upon them. For this great renewal of God's covenant with man we wait and work, and all the advancing forces of civilization will help us along until the goal is reached. Amen.

PIETY OR A LIVING RELIGION?

THIRD DISCOURSE

"And they (the children of Israel) ate of the corn of the land on the morrow after the Passover. Neither had the children of Israel manna any more, but they did eat of the fruit of the land of Canaan that year."
Joshua V, 12.

A GREEK legend tells of a hero for whom a goddess obtained the celestial gift of immortality, but, as she had forgotten to ask for immortal youth, she saw the frame of her beloved one fall into decrepitude and shrivel into a mere shadow, so that death would have been a thousand times more preferable to the intolerable burden of life he had to carry on without even the hope of relief. The prerogative of hoary old age is granted to Judaism by all, whether friend or foe. In regard to endurance Israel is admitted to stand forth unparalleled in history. What a number of kingdoms and empires did the Jew see rise and fall! He saw old Egypt on the pinnacle of her glory, he beheld Assyria and Babylon in their triumphant sway over the nations, and shouted over their defeat. He hailed Cyrus as deliverer, and fought bravely under Alexander and his successors. Judaism riveted the attention of Julius Cæsar; it helped in establishing Christian Rome. Charlemagne and Frederick II, the Hohenstaufen prince, both admired and recognized the Jew's valor. The spread of the Arabian power, the rise of the great Spanish empire were partly due to the Jewish intellect, and he triumphed over the downfall of Ferdinand and Isabella's kingdom. In the Reformation, in the revival of learning he took part, and with greetings of joy he welcomed the new era of liberty, inaugurated in the new world and heralded by France all over the old. Forsooth, the crown of old age cannot be denied us by any. What we claim is the vigor and freshness of youth. In old age, China may surpass us as a nation; perhaps some Eastern sect as regards religion. But from the fountain of youth none has drawn as refreshing and quickening drinks as Judaism. The

power of constant regeneration is our glorious privilege; we have overcome death and destruction both as a nationality and as a religious system, and the secret of our immortal youth is *Reform*.

We are far from claiming Reform as an invention and innovation of ours. On the contrary, we behold in it the vitalizing power of Jewish history. Orthodoxy stamps us, the leaders and representatives of Jewish Reform, as heretics, because, accepting the results of modern investigation on both the fields of natural science and of Biblical and comparative religious research, we no longer stake our Jewish faith upon the belief in the divine, or supernatural origin of the Mosaic laws. We behold in *Mosaism* the result of a struggle continued for nearly a thousand years between lofty prophetism and Hebrew idolatry, the work of priestly compromise between a national and impure worship of the Deity and sublime ethical, world-embracing and spiritual Monotheism. Only in this light we find the justification for so many shortcomings and frailties under which the Mosaic law labors. We can account for a good many inhumanities still tolerated or sanctioned in the Pentateuch. But Orthodoxy cannot. It clings to the letter. We discern the divine Revelation only in the spirit permeating the Mosaic legislation. Orthodoxy perceives the word of God in the petrified form, in the *unchangeable* statutes. Neither do we underrate the work of *Rabbinism*. There is a beautiful narrative in the Talmud, full of suggestive truth. When Moses stood on Mount Sinai, wrapped up in the smoke which hid the majesty of God from his sight, he beheld the future generations of Israel's teachers along the vista of time, hosts of pupils sitting at the feet of each. With wonder and amazement he listened to their discussions, and there, lo! his ear caught the words of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua, the one asserting emphatically: "This is what our great teacher Moses said;" the other contradictingly said: "No, Moses our teacher spoke differently." Moses felt quite bewildered, as he overheard the strange controversy, and exclaimed: "O Lord! I fail to recognize my teaching in what they claim my authority for!" But God rejoined: "Forsooth, it is thy teaching, nevertheless. It is the same truth, the same

underlying idea, only applied to another age and other conditions."

Rabbinism was once Reform, too. It was the unfolding of the Mosaic ideas in accordance with the altered circumstances of life. The Rabbis transformed the laws, given to a people imbedded in a national soil, into regulations for a religious sect scattered over the wide globe. Under their hands, Mosaism thickened into a hard crust to protect the imperilled life of the Jew, as the shell protects the precious pearl amidst the storm-tossed waves which beat against it. But amidst this process of incrustation it deepened Jewish piety; it extended the spirit of priestly holiness over the entire Jewish people, investing every household and each step of life with the character of religious sanctity and purity. Yet all this was due to the regenerative power of Reform. The Bible, I am sure, knows very little of the deep and purifying influence of the New Year and the Day of Atonement as the season of self-examination and repentance, nor of the Festival of the Giving of the Law. In fact, the entire synagogue as an institution of public devotion and instruction is a creation of Rabbinical Judaism. Thus in a great many respects Rabbinism was an improvement upon Mosaism, but, once petrified in thousands of minute statutes and restrictions, its healthy growth was checked. The ethical spirit, the prophetic idea underlying all the laws was lost sight of; reason and common sense were banished altogether from the field of legal decision (the *Halakah*) and reserved only for the digression of the preacher (the *Agadah*). In other words, Rabbinical Judaism was theoretically free, but practically fettered. In this state it remained throughout the middle ages. In vain did the great Jewish thinkers of the Spanish-Arabian period try to imbue it with new intellectual life. Some of them perceived that Mosaism was on the whole a mere compromise, a concession to an immature age, but with their keen flights of thought they only beat, like an encaged bird, against the bars of the prison, unable to break them open.

We to-day feel that we have arrived at a new period. We can and ought no longer submit to the yoke of blind authority-worship. When the Israelites had passed the Jordan,

and the cheering sight of golden corn-fields greeted them on the new soil of promise, the old *Manna* ceased to fall from heaven. Only for remembrance was a flask kept filled with the heavenly bread, but for their daily nourishment they had to cut the wheat, to grind the flour, and bake the bread. The spiritual nurture, too, must be prepared for each age or period of history anew. The old Mosaico-Rabbinical Law is our flask of Manna. It must serve as a holy reminiscence and warning of God, but it cannot be the daily bread for our spiritual use. We want it prepared of the finest produce of our age, after the pattern of the Mount. In other words, we want a religion of life, no dry legality or dead formality.

In denouncing Reform and innovations of any sort, people confound two altogether different things—*piety* and *religion*. We certainly owe reverence and gratitude to our fathers; we ought to honor our sacred bequest of the ages. But does he honor his father better who leaves the inherited estate unimproved and shut up from the influence of modernizing culture, thus allowing it to decay? Or is it not more in accordance with true filial love to have it constantly embellished and improved in value and appearance, so as to perpetuate the memory of its first owner? I shall always remember with longing the deep impressions of my childhood, so sweetly interwoven with the beautiful life our fathers led under the sway of true orthodoxy, while secluded from the intercourse of the great social world around them. What an inexhaustible source of bliss and happiness amidst sorrow, care and trouble was the practice of the religious rites to them! What a fountain of blessing, of elevation and comfort, of spiritual self-sanctification was every single religious custom to them! Not the synagogue only, but the house; not the Sabbath only, but each day was filled with holy thought, an uninterrupted intercourse with God Almighty. Can this life be recalled? Can Orthodoxy, fanatical, inconsistent, and anachronistical orthodoxy conjure it back? As little may the florist undertake to expose his Eastern hot-bed plants, artificially nurtured on our soil, to the fierce blasts of our Western winds. No. Orientalism on our free American soil will not stand the test of time. We want Judaism to be the exponent of a religious

truth for all ages and climes. We want to see Judaism practised in fullest accordance with our Occidental civilization. We ought not to be satisfied with erecting monuments of piety to our forefathers, but should aim to continue their legacy, and to perpetuate their spirit in and through our lives.

Two sacred shrines were carried, the rabbis say, in front of Israel while journeying through the desert, the one containing the two tablets of the covenant with the law of the living God of Israel inscribed on them; the other, the mortal relics of Joseph, the pious ancestor. The former represented the idea of religion, the other that of piety. Let us beware of confounding what we owe to our past with what we are obliged to do for the future. The reminiscences of our great and glorious past should remain sacred to us, but they cannot lead us forward towards the great land of Messianic promise.

In a neighboring synagogue, I am told, a youth was called up last Sabbath to pronounce the benediction upon the law, being initiated into the sphere of Jewish duties, *בר מצוה*, and while every soul in the audience was impressed with the awe of the moment, the reader read from the sacred scroll *חזרע ומצורע*—chapters which, had they been translated into the vernacular, would have filled the hearts of the hearers with anything but religious devotion. Now, for the sake of God and truth, is such horrible self-deception forever to pass as religion? Are we, the reformers, not justified, for the sake of our children, for the sake of the world, for the sake of God's holy name, to insist upon *purified* Judaism, upon thorough Reform of our synagogue service? Are we not justified in asking for a Bible purified from all its offensive and obnoxious elements; for religious forms and practices which elevate heart and soul, in place of such as discredit and disgrace us before the world? What matters it to me if we are denied the power of reforming? I ask in due deference: Will our orthodox rabbis, in the broad daylight of reason, still subscribe to the rabbinical tradition which has caught so little of prophetic truths as to teach:—1st, in regard to conjugal love: "He who lives in matrimony ten years without being blessed with offspring

must divorce his wife and marry another one" (Maimonides H. Ishust, XV, 7); 2d, in regard to slavery: "He who frees his slave of Gentile birth commits a sin" (Maimonides H. 'Abadim, IX, 6); and 3d, in regard to tolerance: "He who on principle or from mere whim disregards any of the Mosaic commandments (as for instance, the dietary laws) has no claim upon pity and compassion, and should rather be thrown into a pit than to be rescued from peril" (Maimonides, Edut XI, 10, and 'Akkum X, 1)?

I say 'rather no Judaism at all than that we should bow under the authority of Rabbinism and surrender reason and freedom.' No. Rabbinic-Mosaic Judaism is dead, but far from degrading it, we wish to lay it, like the broken tablets of the law, שְׂבָרֵי לוחות, alongside of the better system of religious life which we are anxious to build in consonance with the demands of our age.

Stand-still is death. We want a living and working religion. When you behold a grain of seed that has fallen into the small fissure of a rock, take root in the very heart of the stone and split the hard granite, tell me what gave the little seed the power to overcome the mighty stone? It is the superiority of life over death. The dead ritualism of the past will never be able to cope with the living issues of the age. Not because we have introduced reforms, Judaism failed to realize our expectations, but because we have not introduced enough to totally replace the dead rites of the past by living and beautiful forms suitable to our time. We dwelt too long upon the rubbish of the past, neglecting to build attractive quarters for the rising generation.

Ancient history records the noble deed of two brothers who, in a city besieged and threatened with fire, asked the conquering general, who was under some obligation to them, for permission to leave and carry with them what they prized most. Their request being granted, they took their parents, the one the aged father, the other the aged mother upon their shoulders, and left with their precious burden.

We, too, find Judaism, find religion, beleaguered by the powerful forces, mental and religious, of the age. How may we best hope to preserve our sacred heritage? Surely not by

opposing, but by befriending ourselves with the mighty attainments and factors of the time. And if we but succeed in building up a new religious life while faithfully and reverentially continuing our identity with the past, if we provide for the spiritual demands of our children in such a manner as to impress them with the glory of our past and the greatness of our mission as Jews, we shall not only reflect credit upon ourselves, but also honor our fathers and forefathers, being inspired and cheered by the same truth which inspired and comforted them, and with our children be ready and willing to live, and, if necessary, also to die for the same God for whom they lived and died. Amen.

IS REFORM DESTRUCTIVE OR CONSTRUCTIVE?

FOURTH DISCOURSE

"Ye shall keep my statutes, which if man doeth, he shall live by them. I am the Lord."—Leviticus XVIII, 5.

"WHAT is the cause of storms?" a rabbi in the Midrash asks, and his answer is: "Whenever mankind is absorbed in the worship of the sensual, God sends storms and earthquakes to rouse them from lethargy." When after many days of scorching heat the air becomes close and oppressive, so as to make every living being pant for a refreshing breeze, storms are welcomed as a blessing, however vehemently they strike the earth with their hail, thunder, and lightning. They clear the atmosphere, regenerating and quickening all life. Let us candidly admit that our mental atmosphere has of late grown rather sultry. Religious indifference and callousness, chiefly on the part of the progressive ones, encouraged retrogressive orthodoxy to become bold and presumptuous. A tide of conservatism carried us all more or less backwards, until at last the flood reached up to our very hearts, and we felt that, unless we offer energetic resistance, we would lose the ground under our very feet, and become untrue to ourselves, to our aims and ideals as Reform Jews. Having thus far merely maintained our right and our liberty against intolerance and

narrow-minded dogmatism, it behooves us to state the actual merits and claims of Reform Judaism. Reform, we are told, cannot and did not but pull down, 'pluck out,' and destroy. Let us see whether this is really so; whether Reform is merely *destructive*, or whether it is *constructive* and *positive* in its tendencies and in its character.

I answer: Reform Judaism is positive. It desires to build up a pure and perfect manhood. It aims at the realization of a true religion of humanity in full accordance with our text "*Ye shall keep my statutes which, if man doeth, he shall live by them. I am the Lord.*"

Religion, says our text, is not for God, nor for heaven. It is for man—for his elevation, comfort, and inspiration. Judaism does not build its system of salvation upon the hereafter. The world that now is, is its field of labor, and humanity is its fruit. To cultivate and promote all that is human, to unfold all that is noble and good in man, and to impart the blessings of divine love and truth to all sons of man—this, in conformity with cosmopolitan prophetism, is the great aim and object of enlightened Judaism.

Let us inquire then which of the two is better qualified to realize these demands, Orthodoxy or Reform? Does Mosaico-Rabbinical Judaism come up to the mark, while rendering religion an endless number of prohibitory laws and restrictive statutes, erected like bars and turn-pikes on the path of the Jew to obstruct his march, or, like poles and boundary-stones, warning him not to come near this, nor to touch upon that? Do you call that a positive religion which consists only of laws saying: "Thou shalt not do this," "Thou shalt not eat this," "Thou shalt not wear this?"

Look at the priceless treasure Judaism has given to the world—the *Sabbath*. What did Mosaico-Rabbinical law render it but a burden and a heavy yoke? The real positive side, the comfort and cheer, the heavenly bliss of the Sabbath-day, is well-nigh crushed under the pile of restrictions placed upon it, under the thirty-nine chief prohibitions of work, as cooking and baking, culling and sowing, weaving and sewing, building and planting, writing and cutting, and ten times as many derivative ones which Rabbinism counts,

hardly taking regard of the spiritual and human motives underlying the Sabbath law.

Or take the *Passover* festival, the Memorial of Israel's deliverance. What large network of interdictions concerning eating or tasting of leavened bread, or of anything that ferments, has been allowed to overgrow and to entirely obscure the idea of liberty, of the Jew's consecration to God's priesthood which gave rise to the solemn festivity. The sweet reminiscences, the beautiful symbols have almost lost their intrinsic charms beneath the terrors of death facing him who dares to taste a bit of bread or broth that has the flavor of yeast.

Which religion has a grander day to boast of than our *Day of Atonement* is? It is Judaism's brightest jewel. It proclaims man as a child of God, allowing no power, no mediator in heaven or on earth to interfere between man and his Maker, declaring man to be his own priest and redeemer from sin. Yet behold how under the sway of the law this most precious fruit of the Jewish spirit is soured by the over-awing fear of the penalty of excision with which the Father of Mercy is represented to strike him who, during the twenty-four hours, ventures to satiate his hunger or thirst with a morsel of bread or a drink.

And so are all the rules and ordinances offered by the Mosaico-Rabbinical law concerning *domestic life* far from being elevating and inspiring forms of devotion, apt to remind the mistress of the household or the other members of the family of their sacred duties within the domestic sphere; but, void of all moral lessons and suggestive thoughts, they only ring forth in unmelodious, husky sounds the words: "Thou shalt not eat this. Thou shalt not cook this. Thou shalt not mix this and that." There is nowhere provision made for the higher demands of the heart and the mind; nothing in all the legal forms and usages that ennobles and refines the soul. Indeed, a glance over the entire structure of Mosaico-Rabbinical Judaism brings before your mind a thick, impenetrable forest of legal statutes in which you look in vain for the light of heaven to illumine the road. Legality has blown out the light of religion. The deep longing of the soul for the living God has actually

been lost sight of amidst these car-loads of oppressive restraints with which life has been surrounded. And if for the last hundred years people, amidst the common cry for self-emancipation and enlightenment, disgusted with all the hedges and ramparts which had thus long shut them up from the world, commenced pulling down one after the other, who is to blame? Not Reform, I am sure. No Reform rabbi ever told his audience to break the Sabbath, to violate the Dietary Laws, or to eat on Yom Kippur. Amidst the reckless desecration and destruction indulged in by the multitudes, Reform alone dared to be *positive*. Proudly lifting the prophet's staff, it began again to point to the indestructible kernel of religion. In the soul-stirring strains of the ancient seers it preached: "God cares little for your fasts and your outward forms of worship. Loosen the bonds of injustice. Cling fast to virtue. Show kindness. Practise charity and goodness. This is the essence of all religion." Bringing out all that is humane and everlastingly good and true in the ancient laws, Reform endeavored to spiritualize them and lift religion to a higher sphere far above the sweeping storm of destruction. It allowed the husks to moulder in order to make the inner truth shine forth with all its cheering beauty. It inspired all with hope, while Orthodoxy was all despair. Was Reform, then, not *positive*?

Inquiring, furthermore, into the objects and motives by which the Conservative Jew is urged to obey the law, I find the promise of reward in the great beyond to be held forth as chief incentive to duty. "Israel," says the Talmud, "has been privileged to receive so many laws in order to endow it with so many shares in the bliss of the future world." This is the ruling idea of Rabbinism. But does this view stand the test of philosophical enlightenment and moral refinement? How about the noble maxim proclaimed by one of the oldest Rabbinical sages, Antigonus, of Soko: "Be not like slaves who fulfil their duties only for the sake of receiving wages!" Suppose the entire construction of eternity's bliss and misery upon the small circumference of a seventy years' sojourn on earth should prove futile, and our advanced sense of justice would demand a larger horizon and scope for the Divine Economy, is Judaism then

imperilled? Or are the gates of eternal salvation indeed shut to him who disbelieves in Resurrection of the Body, or in traditional Paradise and Hell? Here again the question is pertinent: Is Rabbinism positive which debars reason's progress, or is it rather Reform which lays all stress on the actual duties of life, leaving, like the prophets of yore, the veil unlifted, which God in his wisdom has spread over the domain of the disembodied spirit, saying in the words of Holy Writ: "That which is hidden belongs to God, and that which is open concerns us and our children?"

And there is a third point, most important and grave, which we dare not overlook: All the boasting of Orthodoxy notwithstanding, man is not recognized by the Law in his heaven-born nobility as a child of God. Not only are woman and slave not acknowledged in their full personal worth as self-centered beings, as reliable and totally responsible persons in matters of legal decision or religious devotion and promise, but the very privilege of man, his freedom of conscience, is disclaimed. The idolater and the Jewish heretic, who on principle reject one iota of the Law, are both outlawed. Only he who observes the Noahidic laws of humanity—the proselyte of the gate, to which class Christianity and Islamism belong—has claim on human compassion and love, yet not the heathen. And even the former is denied the privilege of Sabbath rest or of studying Israel's law. In this respect, Talmudism has fallen far below the standard of Prophetical humanity. Far be it from me to throw stones into the well from which we with our fathers have drawn the waters of life. For I know very well that misfortunes dimmed the eyes of our ancestors, so that they could not see far beyond the narrow compass of their own lives. But let at least the most conservative Jew of to-day confess that the old walls have justly and well-deservedly been broken through by the tide of an enlightened age.

Contrast this with what Reform has accomplished. Brushing off the dust and mould of ignorant ages, it made Holy Writ legible again. Pushing aside the vagaries of Talmud, Midrash and Cabbala, it made pulpit and school resound with the perennial teachings of the Book of Books. It caused the lives of the Patriarchs, the workings of the

prophets to appear in new and charming splendor. It aroused the interest of the Jew in all that is human, broad and cosmopolitan, laying stress on character, virtue and personal merit, and regarding the national and temporal as of secondary importance. Pointing to God's revelation to man, it held up the pictures of Abraham and Enoch, of Job or Jethro as lessons with which to measure men on the scale of pure humanity without respect to creed and kin. While rejecting the dusty arena of the Halakah, it delighted to elicit living truths from the green, fertile fields of the Agadah, selecting out of a mass of worthless sayings gems like Rabbi Meir's: "The heathen who practises or studies the Law ranks as high as the Jewish high-priest;" or Ben Asai's: "This is the book of man, this is the foundation-stone of the whole Law, the key to the commandment of love for the fellow-man."

Like Prophetism, Reform rendered *practical humanity* the end of all religion. With this object in view, it nurtured and awakened everywhere the spirit of philanthropy, turning the attention of the modern Jew to the social and moral demands of life. Indeed, most of the institutions of charity and benevolence, by which modern Judaism eclipses the old, may be put to the credit of Reform Judaism which, while laying all possible stress on the humanitarian side of religion, roused the enthusiasm and the devotion of the enlightened Jew for the cause of generous-hearted love and beneficence.

Nor is the issue between Orthodoxy and Reform a mere dispute about claims and merits concerning the past and the present state of Judaism. It is a vital question concerning the future. It is a question of 'to be or not to be,' of religion in general. Behold the drift of our age. It upsets long-cherished views. It unsettles opinions and traditions hoary with age. It takes especial delight in dissolving, undermining, and unhinging established facts and beliefs by critical analysis and doubt. Amidst the gigantic problems which agitate all classes of society, we often feel as though the very ground beneath our feet would give way, since nothing above or below, none of the foundations of heaven or earth, appear stable and firm. Still looking closely at the

aims and objects in view, we find that the mighty onslaught against the institutions and traditions of the past tends to nothing else than to asserting the perfect liberty and grandeur of *man*. What authority has lost in power, humanity at large has gained. Man's intellectual horizon, his domain over nature, his resource of wealth, his insight into the world around and within him, is steadily widening and enlarging. While class, race, and creed interests are pushed into the background, the man comes to the front. All those great social questions concerning labor, education, charity, property and crime; all those soul-stirring contests about the rights and claims of each class and member of human society, what do they aim at but the full recognition of *man*, of the divine individuality in every human being, whether child or adult, man or woman, high or lowly, even in the fallen sinner and abject criminal? Everywhere humanity holds forth its claims high above every title and letter of nobility. And this very spirit of broad philanthropy searches and examines religion after its purely human merits. It endeavors by comparison to bring the human side, the common good as well as the common errors, in every religion to light, in order to render human love and virtue the test and arbiter of all. The most humane religion thus becomes, by common verdict, the best and most perfect one, and only acts which confer the greatest benefits upon mankind are regarded as the holiest ones and the most divine. In short, the destructive tendencies of our age are in fact eminently positive. They do away with decaying, obsolete views, creeds, and rites, in order to make room for a broader and truer, purer and simpler faith, for the great religion of humanity.

Of course, Orthodoxy in all denominations stands aghast at the fearful havoc done by the fierce array of reason's marshalled forces. The adherents of the old tremble at the organized work of overthrowing. Reform, on the contrary, hails the triumphant rise of the new. It beholds in the radical change the realization of its brightest hopes. In this light, Reform Judaism views the present condition of the world. It proclaims a new era for humanity amidst the downfall of letter-worship and authority-belief. Shut up

within his dreary ghetto-walls, crushed beneath the nightmare of subjugating legality and fear, the Jew, with his unparalleled martyrdom, his marvelous endurance and unfaltering faith, was a grand and wonderful spectacle in the eyes of the nations, but he knew not why he suffered so terribly. He only felt that he had a glorious legacy in charge, and he defended it with his naked life. And amidst this great darkness surrounding him, his eyes grew so dim that, when the new day dawned, he failed to see the light which beamed upon the world and his own grand mission. Reform then loosened his bonds by declaring him to be the Messiah of the nations, the priest of mankind. Reform changed his attitude towards the world by telling him to rise from the ruins of the past and be one of the foremost in building, not a Jewish temple and kingdom, but the great, all-embracing *temple of humanity*, the longed-for kingdom of divine truth, righteousness and love all over the globe. Reform enhanced the opportunities of Judaism by defining anew its relations towards Christianity and Islamism, by recognizing their merits, their providential tasks as help-mates and co-workers of Judaism in spreading the belief in the One God of Abraham and Moses, and showing that its own great work for the world's salvation by truth and love is not yet accomplished. Conservative Judaism is, by its very nature, timid and shy in this age of iconoclastic radicalism. Reform rendered Judaism self-conscious, self-asserting, by pointing to the fact that all progress in science, art and industry, every new discovery and research will only form new rounds in the ladder of perfection which leads man up from earth to heaven, from the animal kingdom to God's holy realm.

But in order to truly render Judaism what it should be, the *religion of man*, Reform has still a great and difficult task to fulfil. It must replace *legality* by *intrinsic* and *spontaneous* devotion; it must rule out fear and make love of God reign supreme. Thus far its influence was more negative than positive. It appealed too exclusively to reason. It therefore succeeded in rendering the Jew wiser but not better; we have grown free intellectually but not morally. Having emancipated the modern Jew from the yoke of ceremonialism, it must find other and more appro-

pritate means of cultivating devotion and awakening love of God. It must strive to rouse the heart and engage the sympathies and the emotional side of man, in order to make the Jew realize that religion is not a law, but a positive faculty and privilege of man, a covenant of God as old and as broad as heaven and earth.

Beautifully does the Bible single out the rainbow as the sign and symbol of God's covenant with man. Its wonderful many-colored effulgence of light upon the dark clouds is the most expressive illustration of the great Sun of Truth and Righteousness reflected in man, the manifold conceptions and aspirations of the human heart being only so many shades and hues of the one sublime light that shines on all, though hidden from sight.

Yes, God's Revelation is in all and for all. Away, then, with the barriers which separate us, the priests, from those whom we are to bring near God! The religion which the world is in need of more than ever before, wants humanity, character, justice, charity, freedom, and social happiness as its main elements, and Judaism, with its old, yet ever fresh fountain of inspiration, is ready to offer them to all. Let us understand and realize our mission. Let us step forth, and with uplifted standards of victory win the waiting world. Let us proclaim and practise, and by practising successfully teach the true religion of humanity and thus contribute our share towards making man what he is made for—God-like.—Amen.

PALESTINIAN OR AMERICAN JUDAISM?

FIFTH DISCOURSE. DELIVERED ON THE FOURTH OF JULY,
THE SABBATH AFTER THE SEVENTEENTH OF TAMMUZ

Thus saith the Lord of Hosts: "The fast of the fourth month, and the fast of the fifth, and the fast of the seventh, and the fast of the tenth shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness and cheerful feasts; but love truth and peace."—Zechariah VIII, 19.

THUS the prophet spoke regarding those who continued to bewail the fall of the old temple at Jerusalem, after the foundation had been laid for the new. Already then the views and habits of the conservative and the progressive parties seemed to collide. Dissension and discord threatened to harm the common cause. But the prophet was far from preaching peace at every price. Knowing full well that, as long as truth was not established as the basis, peace was only futile, he insisted on having truth first well grounded, and peace sought for afterwards. And these prophetic words also serve us as a motto: Truth first and then peace!

It certainly required all the boldness and original independence of mind which Einhorn possessed to proclaim the national fast, the memorial day of Jerusalem's destruction a national feast for Reform Judaism, as our prayer-book designates it; to declare that out of the fire of the conflagration of the temple Israel rose rejuvenated as the Messiah of the nations. It certainly is not within everybody's reach to soar as high in the realization of a still distant future. Still every Jew to-day ought to take side with either view, the progressive or the retrogressive one, as regards the Holy Land; he must decide whether this day, as the first Sabbath between the Seventeenth of Tammuz and the Ninth of Ab, should be devoted to wailing over Jerusalem's sad fate, or, being the Fourth of July, given over to joy and thanksgiving in view of the Holy Land of Freedom and Human Rights which on this day was offered to all men and nations. In short, he must face the question, whether we as Jews still mourn over our past political power and glory, buried

under the ruins of Zion, and waiting for a resurrection, or whether we are to celebrate the Fourth of July, not merely as Americans socially, but also as Jews in a political and religious sense as well, thanking the sublime Ruler of History for the new aims and prospects opened on this free soil for the realization of our Messianic expectations? For us, as Reform Jews, the question has been decided long ago. We love Jerusalem as the cradle of our national existence, but we do not long for a return. We behold in Jerusalem's overthrow, not a fall, but a rise to higher glory. For us Zion stands for the fulfilment of humanity's keenest hopes and loftiest ideals, as pronounced by Israel's great seers of yore, and every 'city of Brotherly Love' forms a part and link of the same. Consequently, we perceive in the jubilant tocsin peals of American liberty the mighty resonance of Sinai's thunder. We recognize in the Fourth of July the offspring of the Sixth of Sivan. We behold in the glorious sway of man's sovereignty throughout this blessed land the foundation stone for the splendid temple of humanity we hope and pray for. Why then should we lament over the fall of the old? Still it behooves us to-day to examine a little closer what the Fourth of July means to us, both as Americans and as Jews.

What the privileges are with which the Declaration of Independence endowed us as Americans, I may express in one sentence: It placed a king's crown on every human brow. It invested every human being with heaven-born sovereignty. As the Sixth of Sivan appointed Israel to be a kingdom of priests, so did the Fourth of July render the American nation a priesthood of true human royalty. *Freedom, Equality, and Brotherly Love* form the *three* precious jewels in the diadem of American citizenship.

Freedom is first and uppermost. No oppression from above, no compulsion from without, no obstruction by law, no barrier nor class privilege checks man in the unfolding of his power and his individuality. Free speech, free press, free exercise of all civil rights, free practice of every art and industrial vocation, free expression of thought and opinion throughout the land! What a vigorous, energetic, enterprising and noble type of mankind has this new liberty fostered

and raised! What a splendid, firm and resolute spirit of enterprise and industry has it roused and cultivated! It has pushed the old world into the background. It outshines and challenges the rest of nations in inventive genius, in clearness of judgment, in practical, sound common-sense.

Equality is the second. All are alike before the law. No difference of rank, of blood, class, or creed. Man alone counts. With equal rights and equal duties, each stands against the other, holding the same chance as the other. One opinion is as good as the other; one sect entitled to the same respect as the other. And behold the fruits that grow on the beautiful tree of liberty and equality! A new and decidedly better kind of humanity thrives and flourishes under our benign institutions. The exclusive and offensive particularities of the former immigrants are dropped, and broader views and finer traits take their place. All that is small, clannish and local is, by force of public opinion, pushed aside, and that which is humane and universally good and sweet brought into prominence. Human worth and dignity, human greatness and skill form the standard and object of all endeavors in social and religious life. Great cosmopolitan aims and achievements decide on the value and success of each single effort within the great national fabric.

And here we have already included the third jewel of American life, the spirit of broad-minded liberality and brotherly love. Freedom, far from unbridling passion and selfishness in the genuine American, tended rather to bring out the nobler and tenderer qualities of man. It engendered humility and devotion in his attitude towards God, and generosity and kindness in his relation to his fellow-man. The American is profoundly devout and religious, but his religion has not the flavor of fanatical bigotry. He is by nature tolerant and philanthropic. Without inquiring after birth or creed, rank or profession, he readily and gladly lends assistance to all the suppliants and needy. Church and school, municipal and State affairs help and promote the interests of benevolence and charity. What in other countries the princes, fattened on the marrow of the people, now and then consent to do, all the industrial classes of the

people, high or lowly, vie with each other in accomplishing. Liberality is one of the chief innate traits of the American people. Yes, the American people is a nation of noble-minded sovereigns. And to spread and plant these truly Republican ideas and notions all over the globe is its glorious mission. Its seeds lie deeply imbedded in the wilderness of Sinai, in the truths revealed by our great prophets of yore; but the magnificent tree, as it stands before us to-day, overtopping all other human plantations, is to offer shadow and fruit to all the nations and kingdoms of the world. And this reminds us Americans not only of our debt of gratitude to God, but of our sacred task for future mankind.

Particularly great and solemn is our debt of gratitude and our obligation as American Jews. Not only because we enjoy comparatively greater blessings on this blessed soil of freedom than elsewhere on the globe, but because the very aims and ideals of humanity, which form the essence and soul of our religion, find here a more congenial and fertile soil than anywhere else. Here is the land where milk and honey flow for all. This is the land of promise of a great and new human race. Here the old dividing lines of race and sect are obliterated, and by natural selection a new type and standard of manhood and womanhood is developing. But then it behooves us as Jews to contemplate and to know what position we have to take in the midst of this great nation, and what the duties are which devolve upon us as the divinely chosen people of priests, as the oldest of nations among this, the youngest one in human history.

Brethren! The answer is not difficult. In order to exert our influence, in order to carry out our mission, we must first cultivate and develop the fine qualities which distinguish American life, and then enrich the world surrounding us with those treasures of the mind and the heart which we have stored up during our journey through the lands and ages. It will not do for us as teachers of humanity to remain Hebrews in garb and custom, in views and language. It will not do to offer our prayers in a tongue which only few scholars nowadays understand. We cannot afford any longer to pray for a return to Jerusalem. It is a blasphemy and a lie upon the lips of every American Jew. Neither

ought we any longer to retain the Pentateuch lessons unrevised and unabridged, either in an annual or in a triennial cycle. I revere the venerable Torah scroll as our sacred palladium of the ages, for which our fathers a thousand times sacrificed their lives, and which, in fact, miraculously preserved our own, but I want to have it read, or rather the whole Bible used and perused with caution by way of wise eclecticism. If we may, in the words of Moses, the great law-giver, proclaim: "Which is the people that has laws so wise and just as are ours? And which people has a God so holy and high, and yet so nigh as is ours?" we must, I am sure, bring our religion home to the understanding and appreciation of all the people. We must do away with all that detracts from the grandeur and wisdom of Judaism, and hold aloft only that which enhances its human worth and brightness. If we want to give expression and scope to the great prophetic wish and hope that our sanctuary should become 'a house of prayer unto all nations,' we certainly ought to render our mode of worship, all our religious observances truly attractive and impressive for all. King Solomon's dedicatory prayer, so mindful of the stranger that comes from afar to listen and to see, should ring forth its melodious sounds out of every human heart. Religion humanized and humanity religionized—that is the aim, the beginning and end of Judaism, as Reform understands and expounds it. Now the reform movement, so happily and auspiciously started in the old Fatherland, has there only too soon been interfered with and partly suppressed by the authorities of either the State or the older generation. Free America offers bright prospects for its healthy and vigorous growth and rise. Untrammelled and unimpeded by any power, Judaism may evolve all its strength and its wisdom, and it must naturally assume a really democratic, cosmopolitan character. In this atmosphere of freedom and broad humanity it cannot help becoming a free, practical, common-sense religion, able to enter the arena and compete with the great religious denominations, and striving for victory through pulpit, school, and press. But in order to win in this great prospective contest, it must throw into the background everything

small, clannish, and exclusive. It must drop its Orientalism, and become truly American in spirit and form.

Mark well. We have first to use the pruning-knife and trim our own tree of life before improving those of others. We must first embellish ourselves ere we may embellish others. We must first learn from our American fellow-citizens how to blend religious devotion and piety with freedom. We must first rekindle the flame of religion in our hearts, and at our domestic firesides, before we may enlighten others. We must first awaken religious sentiment and enthusiasm in our children, and render our houses and our synagogues what they were in the dreary ghetto, sanctuaries of faith, temples of virtue and piety; we must first have again, as of yore, our domestic life hallowed by Sabbath rest and sacred festive praise and song, ere we can claim the title and name of God's holy people before the world. Much is needed to render Judaism honored, admired, and influential in our country. Many are the sacrifices we have to bring ere we have reached the standard which commands the respect of those around us. We must first succeed in opening the eyes of our own people, in familiarizing them with our priceless past and our world-redeeming truths, in inspiring our younger generations with love and zeal for our great historic mission, before we dare offer our religion as a model and a bright gem to others. It is true, nowhere has Judaism better chances of becoming the pioneer of a humanitarian religion, nowhere can the Jewish faith venture to be the advocate of the broadest truths concerning God and man, and form the golden chain to embrace all religions and sacred books, and blend them into one religion of humanity than in this blessed new world. Still this requires moral earnestness, a deep religious conviction, a positive, self-asserting faith. And this is what Radical Reform aims at, not by *destructive* measures, but by *constructive* ones, by ever new attempts at building up, just as nature works—recuperating, refashioning and putting up new tissues, while, or even before, the decaying old have begun to shrivel and fall off.

The seventeenth of Tammuz, with its sad reminiscences of Israel's tragic fate, recalls to my mind the touching words of

the saintly martyr, Rabbi Hanina ben Thordion, who, having been found studying the Law in spite of the imperial interdict, was condemned to be burned together with the sacred scroll. His pupils, sorrowing witnesses of his terrible sufferings, stood aghast, wondering at the marvellous patience and resignation which brought a smile on the face of the martyr amidst the most agonizing pains. "What seest thou, O Master, that causes thee to smile in this awful moment?" was their question. "I see the scroll of the Law consumed to ashes, but the letters, as if written in fire, rise up to heaven, as visible testimonies of the Invisible God to whose throne my soul is soaring up."

הַגּוֹיִלִין נִשְׂרָפִין וְהָאוֹחִיוֹת פּוֹרְחוֹת בְּאוֹיֵר. Indeed, this is the secret of the entire Jewish history. The outer shape is being steadily consumed, the Jewish temple, the Jewish nationality, the laws, the rites, all crumble to pieces before the storm which works destruction throughout the ages, but the vital spirit permeating the past continues, ever creating new and better forms in place of the old ones. Israel is the burning bush, and God appears in the fire that burns but consumes not. And only when the fire has spread to fill the entire world with its bright blaze of holiness, only when Israel's God will be worshipped in truth as the King of the nations and the Father of men, the full secret is revealed, the mission of the Jew fulfilled. Amen.

THREE DISCOURSES ON JEWISH ETHICS

FIRST DISCOURSE

SOURCE AND CHARACTER OF JEWISH ETHICS

A.—SOURCE OF JEWISH ETHICS.—Ethics is the watchword of the age. It seems to unite, where religion separates, men. The creeds conflict with one another, and in many instances also with reason, our common inheritance, whereas on the principles of morality all races and sects agree. The practical conclusion, therefore, drawn by many, is to drop religion and teach morality pure and simple. On closer reflection, however, we find that there is no real uniformity or harmony in Ethics either. It is the view of life which dictates its Ethics. For the gaiety-loving Greek, life was nothing but a banquet inviting man to pleasure. Hence his Ethics is hedonistic in character, and it turns on the question of what is 'the highest good,' that is, how to make the best of life, the answer thereto being: "Either the individual, or the State, or finally human society should be used as a means of attaining the highest enjoyment." For the Hindoo, life is a burden of woe, a valley of gloom, and man's only concern is how to escape it; accordingly, sympathy and compassion are the best modes of comfort, while self-effacement, in which all pain is overcome, is the highest possible attainment. Between the Ethics of Pessimism and that of Hedonism, lies Jewish Ethics, which renders life solemn with duty and responsibility. The State cannot enslave man, nor can the wheel of fortune crush him, if he be conscious of his divine purpose. Though there are many Greek elements in modern Ethics, and many Hindoo elements in Christian Ethics, it is in the main Judaism that fashioned the world's Ethics. Indeed, Jewish Ethics will be the main factor in moulding human society in the future.

Ethics is a Greek word (derived from *ethos*, customs, or *aethos*, fixed custom, conduct, and character); the Latin

Morality, from *Mos*, and the German *Sittlichkeit*, from *Sitte*, being translations of the same. It denotes a system or science of conduct, and is a product of Greek philosophy. When faith in the old gods of Greece had been shaken, and the old pagan virtue declined, Socrates of Athens set the minds of his countrymen thinking about that which alone makes life worth living—human conduct, and the outcome of that stirring appeal was the Platonic idea of the beautiful and the good as a cosmic principle reflected in man. But it was left to Plato's pupil Aristotle to define Ethics, in contradistinction to Physics and Metaphysics, as the science of morality.

Now there are some thinkers who deny to us the right of speaking of Jewish Ethics altogether, since the Jews gave the world religion, but no philosophy, neither natural nor moral philosophy. But this is a question of terminology. Far more important is the question: "Did Greek philosophy, in defining or systematizing the rules of conduct, make humanity better?" No. The ethical systems offered by the schools could not save the ancient world from moral decline and ruin. The science of the good does not make us good. Ethics never replaces religion. The impelling force must come from within, from a higher Will and Power appealing to our emotions with the force of absolute authority. It was the genius of the Jew that gave humanity the true impulse of being good, the real substance of morality. The Bible furnished the world with the motive power, the eternal source, and the highest ideal of Ethics. Duty, responsibility, conscience—these ideas were altogether outside of the purview of the Greek or the Hindoo mind. "Thou shalt!" and "Thou shalt not!"—thus speaks the law of Ethics, and there is no law without the Lawgiver. There is no resonance to the words: Thou shalt! and Thou shalt not! without Him who, with the authority of the commander, says: "I am the Lord thy God!" Morality and religion are inseparable. This is the meaning of the first of the Ten Words, or of the whole of the Decalogue.

Jewish Ethics is based essentially upon the fundamental principle that life is full of moral purpose. The world is not the work of mere chance, but has a Designer, a moral

Ruler, and man, imbued with His spirit, has an object, a task to fulfil in this great plan of cosmos. Morality is conscious of purpose; it implies responsibility. Yet to whom are we responsible—responsible, not only for our actions, but also for our motives of action, for those intentions and purposes that make us moral beings? Not to society, which cannot read our thoughts, nor judge our motives, nor make us feel our responsibilities and duties, but to God alone, the living Power that permeates the world as the Source of Morality working for the highest ends and purposes. And here lies the fallacy of all agnostic reasoning, which says: "God cannot make morality; He cannot make badness divine; it is morality which lends God this authoritative power; hence morality is the supreme power to which even God must submit. Therefore have morality, and you need no God." The fact is, God is the very Power of Morality. He is not merely an Ideal of Justice and Purity, conceived of by the Jewish seers, lacking reality, not a mere "simile," a product of human fancy, existing only in the realm of imagination. He is the Power that speaks through conscience and reason to man as the great "I am"; the Mind that rules our mind, the Will that dictates our will, the Judge and Surveyor of our conduct, high above nature, which is unconscious, and above society, which exists only as an aggregate of individuals, yet enthroned as King and Father in every human soul. For man is not, as Aristotle and his modern followers say, a moral being because he is the product of society, born with a certain altruistic feeling that makes him a little less selfish than the brute is, and extends the love the stork or the hen has for her young over a larger household, and over a longer time than one generation. Man is not the result of certain biological, psychological, and social forces; he has a will of his own, he thinks and chooses of his own volition, he is free and able to determine his mode of conduct at every moment; he is the child of God. And this is the soul and essence of all morality, upon which Jewish Ethics lays all possible stress. The idea of God constitutes man's liberty of action and motive, his self-determination, upon which alone responsibility rests. It

is neither reason and knowledge nor the emotions that make man free and strong. The will is the power that stands at the helm to direct action and to determine character. Yet this will of man must receive its dictates from a higher Will, from the supreme authority of an absolutely free Being, from God, the only Redeemer of man. Only as the free son of God can he turn joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain, life and death, into means of moral perfection. The ultimate source of all Ethics, then, is God—this is the truth conveyed by the first verse of the Decalogue.

B.—CHARACTER OF JEWISH ETHICS.—And so the second of the Ten Words defines the *character of Jewish Ethics* to be the striving after *divine holiness*. The phrase the Bible employs for conscience is: "Fear of God." It shields the heathen as well as Abraham against sin. But to the Jew God revealed Himself eminently as 'the God of Holiness.' And here let me emphasize a fact which is too often overlooked. It is the ethical conceptions of the Deity that produced the pure Monotheism of the Jew, not vice versa. We are too much inclined to see, in the Jewish doctrine of the absolute Unity of God, the result of philosophical thinking, and following the rationalistic bent of mind, we are at a loss to understand Revelation. It is a grievous mistake to believe that the human mind, however powerful, can invent or create a God for others to follow and to trust in. Professor Adler, speaking, not long ago, with profound admiration of the Jewish God of Righteousness and Holiness, felt called upon the same time to declare that he could not accept the God of the Hebrews as his, simply because he could not accept the idea of Revelation. While believing in a moral government of the cosmos, he shrinks from believing in a God who lives and speaks and acts for man. Certain it is that without a divine revelation there could be no prophecy. It is the God seen who makes the seer; it is the God felt who makes the prophet. There are thus in the Jewish Revelation three elements blended, the analysis of which is the problem of psychology, rather than of reason. There is the personal element of inspiration. The person who sees the new truth is carried away by it to a degree of rapture and self-absorption far beyond

that of poet or inventor, because he comes in touch with the higher world of vision. There is, secondly, the universal element: the general principles of moral or spiritual truth, voiced by the leader or teacher, and gathering force from the hearers, as they echo their feelings as well. But there is the third and most mysterious of all, the racial element, the instinct which creates the genius of art, of poetry, of law, and represents the highest manifestations of the spirit of a nation. Genius is always a revelation of a divine power working as a flash of inspiration, rather than by the slow process of thought. The genius of the Jew, combining the fiery passion of the Semite with an unique propensity towards universal truths turned the fire which burned so terribly in the cruel and violent orgies of the Moloch and Astarte worship into the purifying flame of a religion of holiness, and Jehovah became the consuming fire to purge the world of sin and wrong-doing, falsehood and impurity. Revelation thus means the coming in touch of man's soul with the World's Soul, the God of Righteousness. Religion everywhere is fear, awe, trembling; but, whereas the heathen religion is fear of fate, woe, and doom, the Jewish religion is turned into a fear of offending a holy God.

Originally intended to prohibit polytheism in the first and idolatry in the second verse, the Second Commandment accentuates the ethical character of the Deity. One expression stands out prominently: "The Lord is a jealous God." This may sound very man-like; it denotes, nevertheless, the high moral standard of the Old Testament Religion, which allows of no compromise with wrong. Whatever the original character of the Sinai God, JHVH in pre-Mosaic time was fire, storm, and earthquake, all the forces of nature became His messengers to establish righteousness on earth; and though He is invested with human emotions and passions in the Bible, these are but attributes manifesting His moral nature. His anger is kindled only to make the world of man a kingdom of justice, truth, and holiness.

Jewish Ethics is character-building, stern, and manly, and, at the same time, tender and humane. It demands, above all, justice, punitive justice to 'the third and fourth

generations of those that hate Me.' Sin works its own punishment in a threefold way—by way of heredity, of influence, through example, and by inheritance of name and reputation which harms. Still the good predominates, working its blessed influence to the 'thousandth generation of those that love Me'; for there are the recuperative powers of the individual, the regenerative powers of the race, ever active for the good. Thus Jewish Ethics takes a serious, but hopeful, view of life, regarding it as a battlefield on which men must win, because God is Leader. Evil is a necessity, because the good is the aim, the thing that should be. Sin and sorrow have educational purposes; they are the forces necessary for the victory, sources of moral strength, both for the individual and for society. "From darkness to light!" is the motto of Judaism. Judaism, in fact, is the only religion that makes the moral uplifting of man, individually, socially, and historically, its aim and object. Christianity infused the pessimistic character of Hindoo Ethics into life. Denying man the crown of divinity, in order to place it solely upon the head of one man, it learned to distrust humanity's powers of recuperation, and, in despair of this world, became all 'other-worldliness,' preaching a love which disregards justice and all the claims of human society. The necessary reaction against this were socialism on the one hand and individualism on the other; the one flowering forth in altruism, a system of ethics noble in itself, but ignoring the claims of self, of the ego, of culture and character, of individual manhood; the other culminating in Nietzsche's 'Ueberschensch' (the Overman), that bold self-assertion of the upper class as master, which ignores contemptuously the lower ones as born to serve, and takes no regard of society at all. Both socialism and individualism are extremes; they represent a one-sided progress, each compared with Christian Ethics. Modern ethics tends towards a return to the first principles of Jewish Ethics, the construction of society upon the foundations of justice, truth, and peace, a striving for character and manhood. Not optimism, which overlooks the hardships of life's struggle, nor pessimism, which leads to despondency and inaction, but, as George Eliot puts it, meliorism, the

hope and the certainty of life's continual betterment, under the guidance of God's infinite goodness, is the key-note of true ethics.

SECOND DISCOURSE

TRUTH, RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND HOLINESS, The Three Fundamental Principles of Jewish Ethics

We are all, consciously or unconsciously, influenced by our surroundings to become imitators. Professor Lazarus justly charges Maimonides with having in his ethical system simply copied Aristotle, and he might have charged Bahya and other Jewish moralists preceding Maimonides with having followed Arabic models; yet Lazarus himself, in his *Ethics of Judaism*, shows himself, on every page, to be a close follower of Kant. It may be said, however, that Kant, in whose veins flowed Scotch blood and Quaker traditions, infused through his 'categorical imperative' the vigor of Jewish Ethics into the theistic philosophy of his day, just as Spinoza superimposed Hasdai Crescas' principle of love upon the utilitarian Ethics of his time. Jewish Ethics, based upon the Old Testament, upon the Rabbinical literature, and, as Professor Lazarus has well shown, upon an unbroken tradition of all the centuries of Jewish history, rests upon three fundamental principles: (A) *Truth*—the word to be taken in the Hebrew sense אמת—truthfulness as related to אמונה, 'firmness,' faithfulness, loyalty; (B) *Righteousness*, צדק, justice in the broader sense, in which it includes צדקה, mercy, kindness, equity, and love, etc.; (C) *Holiness*, which signifies purity and perfection as the highest aim of life.

A.—TRUTH.—One of the brightest and healthiest features of the character of Judaism is its love for, and its implicit faith in, truth. Christian theologians do not tire of telling us, and many men and women of the Jewish camp parrot the words of Paul, that 'the greatest thing in the world is love.' Judaism thinks otherwise. Love is the sweetest, but not the greatest thing in man's treasure house of the soul. Love without truth filled the world with hypocrisy, produced men who said one thing and meant another, and

creeds which promised heaven as a reward for the surrender of truth, yet turned earth into a veritable hell. The greatest thing in the world, says Judaism, is truth. It is the seal of God, the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things, אמת. For truth the greatest of men sacrificed their lives. It is the highest prize for which the ages toil; its pursuit is the vehicle of progress. Upon truth character is founded, nay, upon it rests the whole welfare, material, intellectual, and moral, of humanity. Man is made for truth, as the eye for light, yet its pursuit demands courage, manliness, for we live in a world that deceives us continually. The things that we see are not what they seem. It requires constant struggle and vigilance to arrive at the truth, and still more to abide by it under all conditions. If men lie, it is from cowardice. Fear makes them hide the truth.

For this reason, the oath is resorted to as a means of bringing out the truth concealed. Fear of the divine powers is called upon to counteract the fear of man. An appeal to the heavenly tribunal of justice is to bring to light the full truth. Swearing thus implies faith in a God of faithfulness, 'a God who changeth not.' Upon this faith rests the power of the law, the safety of the individual, the peace of the nations. However, were truth itself always revered as divine, the oath would be unnecessary. Therefore the pious in Talmudical and New Testament times were taught: "Let thy yea be yea, and thy nay be nay." And the Third Commandment, forbidding perjury: "Thou shalt not utter the name of the Lord thy God unto falsehood," was interpreted by the masters thus: "Thou shalt not swear in vain," so as to make people refrain from all abuse and misuse of God's holy name.

But the first ethical principle inculcated thereby is that of truthfulness and loyalty to every promise made. Indeed, greater than faith is faithfulness, upon which all social and commercial relations of men depend. We are too often apt to forget that each business or profession is a trust, the sanctity of which is only formally now and then expressed in the oath administered. He who speaks or acts a lie violates this trust, and will not be left unpunished by the Guardian of Truth.

But loyalty to truth implies far more. Truth is God's holiest attribute. Without truth as its innermost essence, life is not worth living. Martyrdom in the cause of truth made life for the Jew serious and solemn. No bribing of God, no salvation of the soul by the surrender of truth, by hypocritical creed! Every seeker after truth comes near God, including the heathen. The greatest authorities of the Jewish Synagogue were also the boldest searchers after truth, and interpreted the letter of the Law to suit the spirit of Truth. Read *Koheleth* and *Job*, and you find honest doubt encouraged in the Bible. There is, indeed, throughout Jewish literature, a profound reverence manifested and demanded for every truth, that of science as well as of faith, and search after truth is enjoined upon all men. It is regarded as the purest delight and loftiest aim of all minds, for it mirrors the divinity in all. As the colors of the rainbow reflect the same light of the sun, so does all truth mirror the one God in all. For Jew and Judaism, then, truth is the highest principle of progress. It expands, not resting until it has united all men.

B.—JUSTICE AND RIGHTEOUSNESS.—These are the very soul and substance of Jewish Ethics. Matthew Arnold defined the God of Israel to be 'the power that makes for righteousness.' Indeed, righteousness was the great message of all the prophets from Moses to Malachi. Abraham was sent forth 'to teach his children and his house after him justice and righteousness,' and as the Law of Israel is the law of justice, so is the history of the Jew a continual battle for right. We are all apt to be misled, by that fascinating word 'love,' to underrate the pre-eminence of justice. We cannot love all men alike. Love is almost always partial. It overlooks faults, condones wrong, and spoils character. No state, no human commonwealth, can be built upon love. Crime must be held at bay, passion restrained, evil resisted; the criminal himself feels the need of offering atonement for his guilt. Love is sweet for the giver, but humiliating for the receiver. Justice is the only principle of social equality. It asserts the rights of all. "Justice is God," says the Bible, and insists on the vindication of every one's right. No judge has a right to decide

a case in order to favor the poor, declares the Mosaic law, and still more emphatic is the Talmud in maintaining that, whether the concern is of great or of small importance, the right must be defended and fought for. Nor can any act of piety or charity ever cover the sin of unrighteousness. He who steals leather from the rich to provide shoes for the poor is, according to Jewish conception, not a saint, but a sinner. The first question addressed to the soul by heaven's Ruler on the Day of Judgment, according to the Rabbis, is not: "Didst thou have faith, or show love?" but "Didst thou deal righteously with thy fellowman?" Oh, how stern and rigid are the Rabbinical statutes based upon the Eighth Commandment! Not theft and robbery alone, but every unjust dealing, every mode of taking advantage of another's defenseless position is condemned. Every dishonest dollar won by betting or gambling, by so-called corners and futures, is condemned in the Talmud as mammon of unrighteousness, a stain which no charity can wash away.

The Jewish principle of justice, moreover, includes love and mercy, while putting the same on a higher basis. It claims the surplus of the rich for the poor, the help of the strong for the feeble, of the fortunate for the unfortunate, not as a mere gift of condescending charity or befriending sympathy, but as a command and a condition of a divine readjustment. The corners of your field, the tenth of your yearly produce, belong by divine right to the poor, for 'the land is God's,' and He made you His tenants, the stewards of your wealth, on condition that you give to the poor, His people, whatever is accorded to them by the law. He who fails to pay his tithe to the poor, defrauds God.

Surely, our present conditions, under which the rich grow ever richer, and the middle classes are gradually cast into poverty and ruin, require a higher and firmer principle to regulate social progress than philanthropy and love. The lower classes refuse to live on the crumbs that fall from the table of the upper ones. Justice is the cry of the age. Let each capitalist and employer look first to the well-being of the laborer in his employ, and we shall

have fewer strikes and less insecurity in our commercial and industrial life. The world must be rebuilt on justice. There is no race that has fought and suffered for the cause of justice as did the Jewish. The great Austrian jurist, Rudolf von Ihering, declared that Shakespeare's Shylock was right, and the laws of Venice were wrong. Shylock had to fight for his right. This is the tragic destiny of the Jew, and his history will not end until he has established the triumph of right everywhere. We do not pretend to love our enemies, but insist upon our rights. We are the born champions of right against might, of justice against pretentious love.

C.—HOLINESS.—But the highest and loftiest of all principles of ethics, in fact its very essence, is holiness. There is no grander testimony to the religious genius of the Jew than is the attribute of holiness applied to God, in a spirit altogether contrasting with all other religions. All the gods of heathendom were steeped in sensuality and impurity, yet were called holy. The Jewish prophet called God holy as being too lofty, too sublime for sensuality or impurity. "His eyes are too pure to look with delight upon wrong." Holiness became the word for the highest spirituality, for the loftiest idealism. "Be holy, for the Lord your God is holy!" became the highest maxim and standard of Jewish morality; the whole of life, with its thinking and feeling, was henceforth to be lifted to that ideal of perfection. And this became at the same time the chief characteristic of Jewish Ethics. The thought of a holy God should pervade the whole life of man, and hallow it. Accordingly, the Fourth Commandment, the Sabbath Law, enjoins not merely the observance of a day of rest, but the hallowing of labor and industry as well as of pleasure and recreation, of the body as well as of the soul's life, of domestic as well as of religious affairs. And so the Fifth and Seventh Commandments proclaim the sanctity of the home and the holiness of marriage. Marriage for the Jew is not a concession to the flesh, but man's highest obligation to the race. Only a married man could serve as Israel's high priest, to perform the holy functions of the great Atonement Day. There is nothing so low in the life of man but that it

should be permeated by the spirit of holiness; the table and the kitchen, the commonest needs of the flesh, should all be regulated by a law which testifies that a holy God rules in the affairs of men, and leaves nothing unhallowed. The Christian view regards him as a saint who renounces life, abstaining from the enjoyments of this world, which is of the Evil One, in order to live only for the other world. In contradistinction hereto Judaism wants this life, with all that it offers, to be elevated to the standard of holiness; and every enjoyment to be consecrated to God and man, and ennobled by purity of thought and purpose.

Still, that very principle of holiness, which, according to prophetic vision, will at the end of days extend over all things, so as to comprise even "the bells of the horses," created a special law of priestly seclusion for the Jew. In order to rescue the world from degrading and soul-polluting vice, from which not even a Socrates was free, and to lead it to purity and virtue, a race was required, every member of which was to be drilled in soldier-like discipline for abstinence and self-control. Thus the Jews were chosen as 'a kingdom of priests and a holy nation,' to teach humanity by precept and example. The priestly character of the Jew safeguarded his home amidst the allurements of pagan vice. Israel's law of holiness lent man his higher virtue and woman her true dignity. And if to-day we are threatened anew with being engulfed by pagan vice, the Jew must as of yore lead by the example of a holy life. Christian Ethics, with its gaze fixed upon another world, has failed to redeem the human race. Jewish Ethics, which rests on Truth, Justice, and Holiness, as the three pillars of life, and invites religion to help in the work of educating man for his moral perfection and the unfolding of the divine in him, will uplift and save the world.

THIRD DISCOURSE

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN

Besides truth, justice, and holiness, there is another central idea for which Judaism stands most eminently, and which also forms a great social principle—peace and unity between man and man, between the classes, the races, and the sects. Yet there is perhaps no point regarding which there prevails so thorough a misunderstanding of Jewish Ethics among non-Jews as this. Only the other day I received a letter from a Christian friend, who, desirous of paying me a compliment, writes to me: "You are almost a Christian in spirit." He certainly failed to see, to use the language of Lessing's Nathan the Wise, that 'what renders me a Christian to him, renders him a Jew to me.' The fact is that the broad humanitarian character of Jewish Ethics is disputed only by those who know Judaism superficially. To begin with the Bible, what made the Old Testament the household book of mankind, but the fact that it begins with man, and points to the union of men as the end of history? And while Abraham, the ancestor and prototype of the Jew, is represented as a lover of man, Job, an exemplar of true human greatness, is introduced as one not especially belonging to the Jewish kindred. It was in the name of humanity's God that the prophets preached righteousness to Jew and Gentile. "Thou hast been told, O Man, what is good, and what the Lord thy God requires of thee: to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." Except in a few historical references, the Decalogue appeals to the conscience of man and not to the Jew only. In fact, the Law of Sinai as the Jewish covenant is based, according to the ancient Rabbinical view, upon the Noahidic covenant with its 'unwritten laws of humanity.' When, therefore, Paul preached Christianity to the Gentiles, his fellow-apostles insisted that they should be enjoined to practice these Noahidic laws of humanity, so as to become 'proselytes of the gate,' in accordance with Jewish tradition. For all the laws of intolerance towards the non-Jews contained in the Mosaic Law were taken by the Rabbis to be directed only against such as failed to

recognize and practice those laws of humanity. Whatever Christian theologians say to the contrary with reference to the Sermon on the Mount—a compilation of sayings made by the writer of the Gospel of Matthew without any historical foundation—it never occurred to the Jewish teachers that the command, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," applied only to the Jew. On the contrary, the Talmud expressly states that the basis of that law is the chapter of Genesis which declares that man was made in the image of God. And to avoid all misunderstanding the Law reiterates the command: "Love ye the stranger, for strangers ye have been in Egypt." Man as the image of God is to be honored and respected also in the slave, and the criminal is to be regarded as 'thy brother' still.

Proudly, therefore, could Philo, the Jew of Alexandria, and Josephus challenge the Romans and Greeks to show them laws that could compare favorably, in tender human love and compassion, with those of Moses. And this spirit of broad-mindedness pervades all the ethical systems of the mediæval Jewish writers. They deemed it, on the contrary, a doubly grievous sin to discriminate in questions of morality between Jew and non-Jew. Love for all fellow-men is the principle inculcated by all the Rabbis, from Hillel of pre-Christian times down to the moralists living in the darkest age of Christian persecution. The law says not: Behold, these are the commandments which Israel, or the priests, the Levite, are to do, and live thereby, but man is to do them, and live thereby. This shows the simple, humanitarian character of Jewish Ethics. Thus spoke Rabbi Meir of the second century.

In point of fact, long before the Stoics preached a cosmopolitan humanity, the Jews were cosmopolitan humanitarians. And this position they occupied all through the Middle Ages, standing between Christian and Muslim. Nathan the Wise was not a mere invention of Lessing; he took his figure from mediæval literature and history. Whether as a scholar and a statesman, or as a merchant and a broker, or as a philosopher and a physician, the Jew, mediating between East and West, between Church and Mosque, pointed to a brotherhood of man that was

not yet, but was sure to come. A defender of the Unity of God, he worked consciously or unconsciously for the unity of mankind, for the peace of the world, which his seers of yore foresaw in their Messianic visions. Yes, while nations and religions divide humanity, the Jew stands for a religion broader than sect and for a humanity wider than nation. This cosmopolitan mission of the Jew, against which the Zionist purposely shuts his eye, ever did and ever will render him the most potent factor of history, let Mommsen and others call him a 'disturbing element'; we call him the suffering and the triumphant Messiah of the Nations.

SYNAGOGUE AND CHURCH IN THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS, PARTICULARLY IN REFERENCE TO THEIR ETHICAL TEACHINGS

AMONG the wondrous exhibits of this World's Exposition, the Religious Parliament just opened justly claims the greatest attention, for no matter what it may actually accomplish, it is in itself the token and pledge of the approaching realization of the glorious dream of Israel's lofty seers, the time of universal brotherhood of men and of the acknowledged universal Fatherhood of God.

The Executive Board of this Religious Congress have manifested a high sense of justice in according the place of honor to the ancient Synagogue, the sons of Abraham, who since the dawn of history have been intrusted with the charge of proclaiming the one God every-where in order to be a blessing to all nations on earth. Not only as mother of the Church, but as holding forth this great promise of peace to united mankind, the Synagogue stands here the first in the race. Well, then, speaking on behalf of the Synagogue, I wish to bring the message of peace and good will, the sincere offer of fellowship to all religious bodies represented, but especially to the Christian Church, flesh of our flesh and spirit of our spirit, and emphasize the fact, too often overlooked, that Synagogue and Church represent but the different prismatic hues and shades, refractions of the same divine light of Truth, the opposite polar currents of the same magnetic power of love. Working in different directions and spheres, Synagogue and Church supplement and complete one another, while fulfilling the great providential mission of building up the kingdom of truth and righteousness on earth.

The erroneous impression of most people, learned or laymen, is that Judaism is identical with the Old Testament, which represents the rigidity and harshness of the law, while Christianity, founded on the New, holds forth the sweet and gentle sway of love. The German schools of

Hegel and Schleiermacher went so far even as to set it down as an axiom, that whatever is liberal, cheerful, and humane in Christian thought and culture, is due to the genius of Hellas, and whatever is fanatical and austere emanates from the Semitic or Hebrew source.

Semitism against Aryanism was the watchword of David Friedrich Strauss and Ferdinand Christian Bauer before young Renan found the scientific formula which, under the baneful name of Anti-Semitism, has done such great harm when once thrown as a battle-cry and a fire-brand among the masses. Thank Heaven, historical research has begun to bridge the wide gulf and to realize that the Synagogue holds the key to the mysteries of the Church. For after all, Jesus and his Apostles were both in their life and teaching Jews. From the Jewish Synagogue they caught the holy fire of inspiration to preach the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven, for which they had learned to pray, while sending up their daily incense of devotion to the 'Father in Heaven.' The Synagogue was the center of their activity. There they went from Sabbath to Sabbath to offer the gospel to their Jewish brethren, and from there to enlist the attention of the pagan world around. In the Synagogue they found the sick and sorrow-laden in wait of their work of relief and miraculous cures. From times immemorial, every Jewish town or settlement throughout the vast Roman, Syrian, and Persian empires had its meeting-place for common worship and study of the law, and last, not least, for the support of the poor, the sick, and the stranger, yea, a feature which has commonly escaped the notice of writers, also for the reception, instruction, and protection of the Jewish Proselyte. These Synagogues, called by Philo schools of wisdom and virtue, prepared and plowed the soil for Christianity to reap the harvest with the large means and forces at its command. "I was hungry and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in, naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me in prison; and ye came unto me; for whatever ye did to the least of my brethren, ye did it unto me." In these beautiful words of the Son of Man, who as a Judge of the nations addresses the good ones in the future

judgment, Jesus refers to the organized charity work done under the roof of the Synagogue by the Essene brotherhood, and the idea expressed corresponds exactly with the Talmudical word: "He who receives a stranger with Abraham-like hospitality, receives the majesty of God, the *Schekina*."

The entire institution of the Synagogue, unlike the Temple, with its priestly sacrifice, is the creation of the Hasidim and 'Anavim, 'the pious' and 'humble ones,' in the exile, who first poured forth fervent prayers to God as Abinu ('our Father'); who composed the world's matchless treasury of inspiration, comfort, and devotion, the Psalms; from whose circles emanated works of such lofty ethics as the books of Job and of Jonah, Tobit and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.

It is a pity that the Essene traditions and records have not yet received the full attention they deserve, or else there could be no longer any dispute whether the claim of priority for the Golden Rule is due to Jesus of Nazareth or to Hillel, the Jewish master, forty years his anterior. Two centuries before Hillel, Philo. and Josephus, we hear already the maxim inculcated by the sons of Jacob, the Twelve Patriarchs: "Love God, thy Maker, with all thy life, and love thy neighbor with all thy heart. Forgive him if he has insulted thee, and if he plots evil against thee, pray for him and do him acts of kindness, and the Lord will redeem thee from all evil." Love for God, love for man, and love for virtue and fortitude or self-consecration—these were the three rules after which the Essene brotherhood fashioned their lives while striving for the attainment of the Holy Ghost and for that perfection which was to open for them the gates of bliss in the Kingdom of Heaven. They corresponded with the trio of virtues given in Micah VI, 8: "Thou hast been told, O man, what is good and what the Lord, (thy God), requires of thee: To do Justice, love Mercy, and walk humbly with thy God," or with the three virtues singled out by the Psalmist: "Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord and who shall stand on His holy ground? He that has clean hands and a pure heart and lips not defiled by profanity."

How remarkable, then, to find John the Baptist, as he

stood on the shore of the Jordan to invite all the sinners to wash off their sins in the river, and cleanse their souls by repentance, in preparation for the Kingdom of Heaven that was near, preaching, according to Josephus, the same three rules of Essene life: Love of God, love of man, or righteousness, and love of virtue or fortitude of holiness.

There was undoubtedly the power of a great originality felt when this re-risen Elijah had raised the cry of the speedy coming of the Messiah, while hurling his bitter execrations against the hypocrites, those Zebuim or chameleon-like vipers that shine in all colors of piety, relying on Abraham's protection at the gates of hell. Jesus, the young Galilean, was seized by the same prophetic impetus, at first using almost the identical words of his forerunner or master. There was no reason why he should antagonize the teaching of the synagogue any more than John the Baptist did. Was not the very prayer, the so-called Lord's prayer, he taught his disciples according to Luke, prompted by a similar prayer John the Baptist had taught his followers? But he was far from rejecting the old morning prayer of the synagogue. When asked what he took to be the foremost commandment, he began like any Jew, used from boyhood up to begin the day with the benediction for the light and the law, followed by the *SHEMA*, with that ancient watchword: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart;" and then he declared as the next one: "Love thy neighbor like thyself." But we have the emphatic declaration from his own lips: "Think not that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets, I came not to destroy but to fulfill, for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth shall pass away, one iota shall in nowise pass away from the Law till all be accomplished." Never was the so-called Sermon on the Mount intended to supplant the Law of Sinai, as the gospel of Matthew would have it. According to the far more exact report of Luke, it was the solemn consecration of the disciples to their great task of living in a state of poverty, privation, and contempt, while going forth to preach the Kingdom of God. It was the *Torat* or *Mishnat* *Hasidim*, a code of ethics not intended for the many, but

for the few elect, for those forming a holy congregation within the Congregation of Israel, the ideal servant of God, who gives his back to the smiter, only eager to be the light, and the lasting covenant of salt to humanity in the midst of decaying earthly life. "The lovers of God take insult and contumely and resent not, knowing that when they depart this earth they will shine like the sun in its full glory." This is the Talmudic version of the same Essene teachings as were couched by Jesus in the well-known words: "If you love only those that love you, if ye only reciprocate kindness and love when you are sure of its return, what are you more than the 'Amme Haaretz, the careless and sinful people of the land'" (not Gentiles, as the Greek writers put it). "You who desire to be sons of the Most High and to have God as Father dwell in your midst, you are expected to love your enemies, to do good to those that hate you, to bless those that curse you, and pray and fast for those that insult you. Let people in general, the men of little faith, the Ketane Emunah, be anxious, saying: "What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Or wherewithal shall we be clothed? As for you who ought to be heroes of faith, Ba'ale Emunah, who read daily the chapter of manna, the bread which rained daily in the wilderness for the good and for the bad, take no thought for the morrow. Behold the birds of heaven. They sow not, neither do they reap, yet your Heavenly Father feedeth them. Behold the lilies of the field, whose exquisite purple color reminds us by their very name, 'King Lilies,' of all the splendor of King Solomon's robes, and they eclipse it, even. Has not each hair on your head its own channel of nurture, in order not to interfere with the others? How much more is every human being provided for in God's paternal care!" All these beautiful sayings dropped from the lips of the Jewish Essenes of the Talmud as well as from Jesus. Before the maxim, "Lay not up treasures on earth, where moths and thieves may take them, but lay up treasures for yourselves in Heaven," was penned in the New Testament, Monobaz, King of Adiabene, the Jewish proselyte, son of philanthropic Queen Helena, in the time of Jesus, preached it to his own greedy brothers. Let others guard against the transgressions of the commands:

"Thou shalt not murder. Thou shalt not steal, nor swear falsely!" You who wish to ascend the hill of God and not go down to hell's pit, beware of anger, of calling your brother by names, of keeping sheep and goats that do the stealing for you, of swearing in vain or profaning the name of God. "Let thy yea be yea, and thy nay, nay." This is the rule of the Hasidim. It was the boast and constant prayer of these Pious Ones that neither they nor their beasts or property should ever cause others to stumble. Hence the declamation of Jesus: "Woe to the man through whom stumbling cometh. It were better for him to have a millstone hanged about his neck and be sunk into the bottom of the sea." Oh, how the blood curdles in our veins as we hear Jesus cry forth: "If thy right eye, or thy right hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not thy whole body go to hell." Yet the Galilean preacher was not the only one who used this phrase. R. Tarfon has the identical saying in the Talmud, and even the threat of Gehenna's fire against him that lusts after another one's wife by the mere clasping of hands, is derived from Scriptures.

These instances, which could be greatly multiplied, may suffice to show that Jesus was a true son of the Synagogue. Still, it is a mistake on the part of Jewish scholars to place him alongside of or even beneath Hillel, the liberal schoolman, and Philo, the mystic philosopher. Jesus belonged to no school. He was a man of the people. In him the Essene ideal of love and fellowship took a new and grander form. Unlike John the Baptist, he felt drawn by the magic power of divine love to the very lowest of his fellow-creatures. With true greatness of mind, he sat down with those shepherds, publicans, and sinners, who, in the eye of his brother-Essenes, were doomed, and whose very touch seemed to them to be polluting, and ate and drank with them, saying: "I have come to save the lost sheep of Israel, not the healthy but the sick are in need of the physician." There were Essenes who would not mind pollution while teaching the Law, saying: "Can the law be defiled? As well may fire or the great ocean, the fount of purity, be contaminated."

In similar manner, Jesus asserts: "The heart that engenders evil thoughts is impure, not the hand. O ye Pharisees, ye cleanse the outside and leave the inward parts filthy with wickedness. Of you hypocrites, Isaiah well said: 'With their lips they draw near me, but their hearts are far from me.'" This is the language of a prophet, a bold reformer. There was at least one school of the Pharisees, that of Shammai, who discountenanced arbitrariness and licentiousness in regard to divorce. Among them, R. Eliezer said: "The altar of God is covered with tears when the wife of a man's youth is divorced, for 'I hate the putting away,' saith the Lord through Malachi." Jesus goes straight to the bottom of the truth, saying: "God spoke: 'The twain shall be one flesh. What God has joined together, let not man put asunder.'" The same sweeping force of a great truth is voiced by him in regard to the adulterers. The ancient saints of Jerusalem would release the woman suspected of adultery from the ordeal prescribed in the Law, when the husband is not perfectly free from blame. Jesus put it in still bolder form: "Let him that is without sin first cast a stone at her." Did not the Essene, Simon ben Johai, declare the law of the prodigal son in Deuteronomy XXI, 18, to be but a symbolical lesson, yet of no practical bearing? Jesus, in his profound sympathy with the erring, went farther still, and suggested in his parable that the prodigal son might turn out the better one after all.

And with the same courage of true love with which he reclaimed the sinner, he solicited the company of woman, the very target of Satan's arts and tricks in the eyes of the Essenes, and broke the power of her doom. At his awe-inspiring presence, Mary Magdalene, whose long hair-locks were the very network of evil spirits to entangle men into adultery, according to Talmudical tradition, melted into tears of repentance, to become his most faithful follower to the very grave, and the first witness of his resurrection.

With the same freedom of the spirit, he loosens the fetters of the Sabbath laws. To be sure, the Essene brotherhood turned the somber and austere Sabbath of priestly tradition into a day of festive cheer and thanksgiving, of social and spiritual elevation and comfort. Still, the

schools clung fast to the letter, forbidding even the curing of the sick, until the saints of Jerusalem, of whom Simon ben Menasea was one, declared: "The Sabbath was given to you, not you to the Sabbath." Yet how in a case of ailment without danger? Quick to penetrate into the principle of Essene lore, Jesus pursued his work of healing on the Sabbath, saying: "The Sabbath is given to man, not man to the Sabbath." And so in regard to the plucking and eating ears of corn in the week preceding the Omer or thanksgiving sacrifice of corn (the second Sabbath or week of the First Month—the term in Luke being misunderstood).

He certainly was a master mind, a great individuality, a religious genius, while at the same time a true Essene, the paragon and acme of the order of Ḥasidim. But Providence had designated him to be more than preacher and saint. He died as martyr of the Essene principle. He was not the first to denounce the greedy house of the High Priest Ḥanan. The Talmud has preserved the prediction of an Essene father to the effect that strife and greed will be the ruin of the second temple, just as murder and idolatry were those of the first, but (according to Jeremiah XXXI, 6), the Notzrim (watchmen), will come from Mount Ephraim, under the cry: "Yahve Hosha," 'Lord save the people of Israel.' Did these remarkable words ring in the ears of Jesus of Nazareth, as he, bursting forth into a fire of just indignation at seeing Jerusalem with its temple turned into a poultry and cattle market and money-exchange for the priestly house of Hanan, raised the cry that shook the temple to the very core: "Is it not written: 'My House shall be called a House of Prayer for all nations'; but ye made it a den of thieves." Surely, the moment he seized the tables and chased money changers out of the temple precincts, a new spirit must have taken hold of him, he must have realized something like a Messianic calling of his. And who can tell whether at that moment, so full of awe, he may not, while referring to that ancient prophecy of the Notzrim in Jeremiah, have spelled forth the holy name of Jehovah, combining it with his own name, Joshua of Nazareth, so as to fill the very air about him with sights and visions of the Son of Man in the clouds, and at the same

time shocked and alarmed the bystanders with the blasphemous word or act of a 'seducer,' 'corrupter,' 'blasphemer' and 'magician.' From that hour, on, he knew that he would be, as he said: "Delivered to the high priest and Sanhedrin to be condemned to death, and then handed over to the Gentiles to be mocked, scourged and crucified." He fell a victim of his Essene zeal for the true sanctuary of God at the hands of his Roman executioners and his cowardly Sadducean judges. There was no reason for the Jewish people at large, nor for the leaders of the Synagogue, to bear him any grudge, or to hate the noblest and most lofty-minded of all the teachers of Israel. It was the anti-Semitism of the second century Church that cast the guilt upon the Jew and his religion. Jesus died praying for the forgiveness even of his cruel murderers—a true Essene Jew.

Before the church turned into a persecutor of the innocent Jews, the followers of Jesus, the crucified Christ, were simply Jews themselves. Let me call special attention to the remarkable fact, not noticed as yet, as far as I can see, by any theologian, Jewish or Christian, that the entire order of prayers for the evening, for the morning and the Sabbath, was taken word by word from the Synagogue, and preserved in the last two Books of the Apostolic Constitutions, a collection belonging to the second century. These early Christians never dreamed of beholding in their departed Messiah any other than a human being, lifted by his saintly martyrdom as the pure white lamb of God up to the throne of heaven, working, by his very death, as the Man of Sorrow, the ideal saint and sufferer of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, atonement for their sins. And if they saw him in spiritual garb right near them as companion and brother at their Essene love-feasts, they beheld in him only the first among the children of God, the embodiment of all Essene virtue and holiness, the very ideal of greatness and tenderness, yet still a man and a brother, in heavenly luster shining like the sun. There is nothing in the oldest Apostolic teaching and Church manual for proselytes that was not directly taken over from the Essene tradition. Only when the simple life of Jesus was no longer remembered as a

grand human pattern of purity and love, but from an atoning high priest or Passover lamb turned into a metaphysical principle of the world, the Logos or creative word of God; when he, who in his great humility declined even the title of 'good master' because it belonged to none but God alone, was lifted above the reach and ken of humanity to be inborn Son of God turned flesh; when finally all the mythological and gnostic elements of Egypt, Syria and Alexandria were blended with the nature of the man Jesus, then the leaders of the Synagogue apprehended danger for the pure monotheistic faith in the keeping of Israel and rejected the Church as one of the many gnostic law-destroying heretics or Minim. Still, the intercourse was not broken off altogether, neither the anathema of the Synagogue nor the Sunday service with its hailing of the light of the first day as symbolical of the newly-risen Sun of righteousness, could eliminate the Jewish character of the Church and Sabbath worship. With the downfall of Jerusalem's temple and the final overthrow of Judea, however, the prediction of Jesus seemed fulfilled. The victory of Rome established also the triumph of the Christian cause. The Church, making peace with Rome or Babel, the beast of Satan of the Apocalypse, while disowning the mother Synagogue, set out to win the world for the man-God, while the Synagogue with its untrammelled idea of the one God and Father, spiritual and holy, with its historical past and hope for the future, clung all the faster to the Law as its center and citadel. The Church rose like the sun over the nations, while amalgamating the Pagan elements. The Synagogue protested against such compromise, while waning like the moon before the daughter religion, only hoping for a renewal. The Church, pointing to the temple ruins as the death warrant of ancient Israel, became aggressive; the Synagogue was pushed into the defensive, scattered and torn into shreds. The Church became the oppressor, the Jew the martyr; the Church the devouring wolf; Israel the lamb led to the slaughter, the man of sorrow from whose wound the balm of healing was to flow for the nations.

The roles seemed exchanged. Sixteen hundred years of persecution, however, could not exterminate the remnant

of Israel. The Synagogue proved its safeguard, its fortress and shield. Judaism remained, because its soul, the Law, was indestructible.

Here, then, we come to the real issue between Church and Synagogue. It can not and ought not to be denied that the ideal of human life held up by the Church is of matchless grandeur. Behind all the dogmatic and mystic cobwebs of theology there is the fascinating model of human kindness and love, a sweeter and loftier one than which was never presented to the veneration of man. All the traits of the Greek sage and Jewish saint are harmoniously blended in the man of Golgotha. Not ethical system or religious catechism, however broad and pure, could equal the efficacy of this great personality, standing, unlike any other, midway between heaven and earth, equally near to God and to man. He was the ideal representation and symbol of the Essene brotherhood, nay, the perfect brotherhood of man personified. And if the organizations of charity connected with his name were not new to those brought up under the shadow of the Synagogue, they became the marvel of the Gentile world and accomplished wonders there. Jesus, the helper of the poor, the friend of the sinner, the brother of every fellow-sufferer, the comforter of every sorrow-laden, the healer of the sick, the uplifter of the fallen, the lover of man, and the redeemer of woman, won the heart of mankind by storm. Of what avail was the proud philosophy of the sage, or the depraved religion of the priest to a world longing for God and for redemption from sin and cruelty? The time was ripe for a social upheaval, for a millennium, in which the proud ones would be humbled again and the little ones become great. Jesus, the meekest of men, the most despised of the despised race of the Jews, mounted the world's throne to be the earth's great King. Was this not a victory of the Jewish truth, the triumph of the humanity and philanthropy taught and practiced in the Synagogue?

There were, however, three radical defects in the system of the Church. First, all the salvation preached, the love and charity practiced, were all made dependent upon the Creed. The rich treasures of the love of the Father in Heaven were all withheld from those who failed to recognize

the sonship of Christ, the sole distributor. The world was divided into believers and unbelievers; hence, all the fanaticism and cruelty toward heretics and dissenters. Secondly, to be a true follower of Christ, one had to shape life after the patterns of the Sermon on the Mount—to renounce wife, wealth and comfort, and lead the life of a monk or nun, offering no resistance to acts of injustice, and forget the claims of home and country, of state, and society, the demand of justice and manhood, of intellectual progress, and of industrial enterprise. There was no room left for civic virtue. The Church had to create a double code of ethics, one for the privileged class of monks and priests, and another for the laic world; one for the faithful and one for the infidel. Here the door was opened for every vice, to the eradication of which Jesus had devoted his whole life.

And the third fault of the New Testament ethics is that it turns the human gaze too exclusively to the life beyond the grave, forgetful of the duties of life here on earth. True enough, the symbol of the cross had lent to human life a deeper pathos, and to sorrow and suffering a holier meaning. It has robbed death of its horrors and lifted the soul from an unsatisfactory existence into the realm of a richer and higher life. Hence, the sweetest strains of music, the sublimest flights of art and poetry, emanated from the Church. What power of inspiration moved a Michael Angelo and a Raphael, a Palestrina and a Bach, a Dante and a Milton! What a crown of real saintliness adorns the brows of the Sisters of Mercy or the Brotherhood of Misericordia! What a nobility of sentiment there is in a Father Damien or in a Las Casas! And to the asylums for orphans and waifs, to hospital and poor-house, Protestant Christianity added the school-house and the reformatory, the family Bible, and individual freedom. Still, amidst the exclusive cultivation of the emotional side, the intellectual culture of mankind was neglected. Blind faith laughed knowledge to scorn. The simplicity of ignorance became a virtue, and science a snare and a sin of the devil. Reason fell into disuse. *Credo quia absurdum* became the rule; the free-thinkers were cast out as heretics. The consequence was that the Church of Christ was finally split into Churches.

The New Testament was found insufficient to serve as basis for the social structure of mankind. The Reformation, in the endeavor to establish greater freedom and broader manhood, went back to the Old Testament, to the Mosaic Law. And even in our day, we saw Henry George, and before him, Proudhon, point to the Mosaic system of land and labor division as a pattern or suggestion for their socialistic ideas and plans.

It was the Synagogue that, before and with the Mosque, held up the light of culture and learning, the torch of science, at the time when there was densest darkness round about the Church.

The Synagogue made study the first religious duty of the Jew. It was the father's pride ever since Josephus and Philo to have his sons trained well in the Law. The entire life of the Jew was soldier-like drilling for the sacred battle in behalf of truth. Let Temple and State sink into ruin, the school-house will save Israel from shipwreck, was the consoling word of Jochanan ben Zakkai, the witness to the destruction of the Temple. True, the Synagogue had no life, no ideal of human greatness to point at, as uplifting and inspiring, as was presented by the Church in her Christ. All the greater scope was left for each individual to work out his own salvation. Instead of offering one perfect pattern of humanity, Judaism holds forth as maxim: "God is the only pattern of holiness; men are but strivers after the ideal." But while Judaism fails to offer a perfect human model of individual greatness, it presents a far safer basis of social ethics than the Church does. The Decalogue is a better foundation to build on than the Sermon on the Mount. Society can not be reared on mere love, an element which is altogether too pliable and yielding. Justice and law are the pillars of God's throne. Love is but the shining countenance of the divine ideal. The stability of life rests on immutable law. The tablets with the eternal "Thou Shalt!" and "Thou Shalt Not!" lend to the right and the true their awe-inspiring authority. Justice implies the right of every being. Altruism is fallacious if it disregards the claims of the ego. Saints are proper people for heaven; the earthly life demands men of sterner stuff, of good sense and self-respect.

Judaism is the embodiment of a noble contest for righteousness, independence, and truth. The Law rendered the Jew sober, practical and self-reliant. Church charity often pauperized the masses. The poor Jew was upheld and uplifted by discretion and good judgment combined with love.

In the Synagogue, reason dominated over the mysteries of religion. Ceremonialism was, after all, a good school of temperance and privation for the Jew to concentrate his mind on the practical objects and aims of life. Dogma never became a fetter to winged thought, nor was the shadow of the dark beyond allowed to obscure the view of life. Whatever harsh things are said concerning the rigor of the law, the chief feature of the religious life of the Jew was its cheerfulness. The Sabbath meant joy for every home, nay, for every heart, even for the homeless. In the midst of all the gloom of the Ghetto, the optimistic view prevailed. "No evil but works for the good" was the general maxim. Consequently there was a willingness on the part of the Synagogue to recognize also the soul of truth in every error, instead of condemning the same. I wonder whether any father of the Church ever showed such good will to the Synagogue as the leading authorities of the Synagogue, Moses ben Maimon, the great thinker of Cordova, and the Castilian poet and philosopher, Jehudah Halevi, displayed toward both Church and Mosque when declaring that both Jesus and Mohammed are God's great apostles to the heathen, intrusted with the task of bringing the nations of the West and East ever nearer to God, the universal Father? And which of the Churches has a word to match the grand declaration of the rabbis made at the very time when the gospels were composed, that "all the good and the just among the heathen have as good a share in the bliss of the world to come as the descendants of Abraham"—a view which became the generally recognized dogma of the Synagogue.

Thus, in the great battle between Moslem and Christian, between faith and reason, between love and hatred, the Jew stood all through the ages pointing to a higher justice, a broader love, to a fuller humanity, ever waiting and working for the larger brotherhood of man. While standing in

defense of his own disputed rights, the Jew helped, and still helps, in the final triumph of the cause, not of a single sect, or race, or class, but of humanity; in the establishing of freedom of thought and of conscience, in the unfolding of perfect manhood, in the rearing of the Kingdom of Justice and Love, in which all creeds and nationalities, all views and purposes, blend like the rainbow colors of the one bright light of the sun. Judaism begins and ends with Man—"Not unto us, O Lord, to Thy name belongs the glory." Not a single man, however great, not a single Church, however broad, holds the key to many-sided Truth. Like this great parliament—humanity voices the truth in many forms and tunes.

Sinai, cloud-enwrapped, stands out lonely in the desert, crying forth: Move onward, ye wandering shepherds. Golgotha, with its golden aureole around the brow of one single saintly sufferer, forms a high peak in the promontory of truth and love, but fails to offer standing-room for all God-seeking tribes of mankind. But Zion, with all the hills of God and all the worshipping nations and ages round about, towers far higher yet. When life's deepest mysteries are once all spelled forth, and God is sought and found, revealed and felt everywhere, when to the ideals of sage and saint that of the perfect lover of man has been joined, the seeker after all that is good, beautiful, and true, then Church and Synagogue, Jew and Gentile, the pursuer of love and the pursuer of righteousness and truth, will have merged into one Church Universal, into a humanity in the likeness of God, into the city whose name is 'The Lord is there.'

HUMAN BROTHERHOOD AS TAUGHT BY THE RELIGIONS BASED ON THE BIBLE

TO CHICAGO belongs the credit of having rendered her World's Fair a World's University of arts and industries, of sciences and letters, of learning and religions. Humanity, in all its manifestations of life and labor, in all its aspirations and problems, is there exhibited and finds a voice. And the grandest and most inspiring feature of the unique spectacle is the Religious Parliament, which, in trumpet tones resonant with joy and hope, peals forth the great truth of the Brotherhood of Man based upon the Fatherhood of God.

Thanks to our common education and our religious and social progress and enlightenment, the idea of the unity of man is so natural and familiar to us that we scarcely stop to consider by what great struggles and trials it has been brought home to us. We can not help discerning beneath all differences of color and custom the fellow-man, the brother. We perceive in the savage looks of the Fiji Islander, or hear in the shrill voice of the South African, the broken records of our history; but we seldom realize the long and tedious road we had to travel until we arrived at this stage. We speak of the world as a unit—a beautiful order of things, a great cosmos. Open the Bible and you find creation still divided into a realm of life above and one below—into heaven and earth, only the Unity of God comprising the two otherwise widely separated and disconnected worlds, to lend them unity of purpose, and finally bring them under the sway of one empire of law. Neither does the idea of man, as a unit, dawn upon the mind of the uncivilized. Going back to the inhabitants of ancient Chaldea, you see man divided into groups of blackheads (the race of Ham) and redheads (Adam); the former destined to serve, the other to rule. And follow man to the very height of ancient civilization, on the beautiful soil of Hellas, where man, with his upward gaze (Anthropos), drinks in the light and the

sweetness of the azure sky to reflect it on surrounding nature, on art and science, you still find him clinging to these old lines of demarcation. Neither Plato nor Aristotle would regard the foreigner as an equal of the Greek, but consider him forever, like the brute, fated to do the slave's work for the born master—the ruling race.

Let us not forget that prejudice is older than man. We have it as an inheritance from the brute. The cattle that browse together in the field, and the dogs that fight with each other in the street, will alike unite in keeping out the foreign intruder, either by hitting or by biting, since they can not resort to blackballing. They have faith only in their kin or race. So did men of different blood or skin in primitive ages face one another for attack. Constant warfare bars all intercourse with men outside of the clan. How, then, under such conditions, is the progress of culture, the interchange of goods and products of the various lands and tribes brought about, to arouse people from the stupor and isolation of savagery?

Among the races of Shem, the Ethiopians have still no other name for man than that of Sheba—Sabean. Obviously, the white race of conquerors from that land of Sheba refused the blackheads found by them on entering Ethiopia the very title of man, not to mention the rights and privileges of man. Yet how remarkable to find the oldest fairs on record held in that very land of Sheba, in South Arabia, famous from remotest times for its costly spices and its precious metals! Under the protection of the god of light, the savage tribes would deposit their gold upon the tables of rock and exchange it for the goods of the traders, being safe from all harm during the festive season of the fair. Under such favorable conditions, the stranger took shelter under the canopy of peace spread over a belligerent world by the scepter of commerce. What a wide and wonderful vista over the centuries from the first fairs held in the balsam forests of South Arabia to the World's Fair upon the fairyland created by modern art out of the very prairies of the Western Hemisphere! And yet the tendency, the object, is the same—a peace-league among the races, a bond of covenant among men!

It is unwise on the part of the theologian to underrate the influence of commerce upon both culture and religion. Religion is, at the outset, always exclusive and isolating. Commerce unites and broadens humanity. In widening the basis of our social structure and establishing the unity of mankind, trade had as large a share as religion.

The Hebrews were a race of shepherds, who were transformed into farmers on the fertile soil of Canaan. In both capacities they were too much attached to their land—being dependent either upon the grass to pasture their flocks or upon the crops to feed their households—to extend their views and interest beyond their own territory. When, therefore, Moses gave them the laws of righteousness and truth upon which humanity was to be built anew, he did not venture to preach at once in clear and unmistakable terms the great fundamental principle of the unity and brotherhood of man. He simply taught them: "Hate not thy brother in thine heart! Bear no grudge against the children of thy people, but that thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; I am the Lord!" He would not tell them: "Love all men on earth as thy brethren!", for the reason that there could be no brotherhood so long as both the material and religious interest collided in every way, and truth and justice themselves demanded warfare and struggle. Monotheism was more than any other religion an isolating power at first. It was in times of prosperity and peace, when Jews were first brought into contact with the great trading nation of Phœnicia, that the idea of man widened with the extension of their knowledge of the earth, and they beheld in the people of the hot and the cold zone, in the black and blonde-haired men, in the Caucasian and African races, offspring of the same human ancestors, branches of the same parent stock, children of Adam. At the great fairs of Babylon and Tyre, where the merchants of the various countries and remote islands came with their worldly goods for their selfish ends, a higher destiny, the great hand of Divine Providence, was weaving the threads to knit the human race together. And in one of these solemn moments of history, some of the lofty seers of Judah caught the spirit and spelled forth the message of lasting import: "All nations of the earth shall

send their treasures of gold and spices, and their products of human skill and wisdom on horses and dromedaries, on wagons and ships to the city of Jerusalem; yet not for mere barter and gain, but as tokens of homage to the Holy One of Israel, whose name shall be the sign and banner of the great brotherhood of man." This is the idea pervading the latter part of Isaiah. No sordid trading after the fashion of the Canaanites, but truth and knowledge will be freely offered on the sacred heights of Jerusalem. Such was the vision of Zechariah prompted by the sight of the fairs held in the Holy City. (See *Movers: Phonizier II*, 3, 145.) It was the idea of a great truce of God amidst the perpetual strife of the nations which they conceived of and forecast when announcing the time when 'swords shall be turned into ploughshares, and war shall be no more.'

Never would the tenth chapter of the book of Genesis, with the lists of the seventy nations, have been written to form the basis for the story of Adam and Noah, the pedigree of man, and at the same time the Magna Charta of humanity, had not the merchant ships of the Phœnicians opened this wide world-encompassing view for the Jew, to cause him to behold in the many types of men the one and the same man. It was on the Tarshish ship that the prophet Jonah had, amidst storm and shipwreck, to learn the great lesson that the heathen men of Nineveh have as much claim on the paternal love and forgiving mercy of Jehovah as the sons of Israel have, as soon as they recognize him as their God and Ruler. Who dares ask the question: "Who is my neighbor?", after having once read in the grand book of Job the words: "Did I despise the cause of my man-servant or maid-servant when they contended with me? What then shall I do when God riseth up? Did not he that made me in the womb make him, and did not he fashion us in the same mold?" (Job XXXI, 13,15.)

The Talmud contains an interesting controversy between Rabbi Akiba, the great martyr hero of the time of the last Jewish war with Rome, and his friend Ben Azzai. The former maintained like Hillel and Jesus before him, that the Golden Rule, "Love thy neighbor as thyself" (Levit. XIX, 8) is the leading principle of the Law. Ben Azzai

differed with him saying: "This does not explicitly state who is included in the law of love," and he pointed to the first verse of the fifth chapter in Genesis: "This is the book of creation of man; in the likeness of God has he created man." Here, he said, the principle is laid down: "Whosoever is made in the image of God is included in the law of love."

No better commentary can be given to the Mosaic commandment than that furnished by Ben Azzai. Cut loose from the rest of the Biblical writings, many a passage concerning God and man still has an exclusively national character, betraying narrowness of view. But presented and read in its entirety, the Bible begins and ends with man. Do not the prophets weep, pray, and hope for the Gentiles as well as for Israel? Do not the Psalms voice the longing and yearning of man? What is Job but the type of suffering, struggling, and self-asserting man. It is the wisdom, the doubt, and the pure love of man that King Solomon voices in prose and poetry. Neither is true priesthood nor prophecy monopolized by the tribe of Abraham. Behold Melchizedek, Salem's priest, holding up his hand to bless the patriarch. And do not Balaam's prophetic words match those of any of Israel's seers? None can read the Bible with sympathetic spirit but feel that the wine garnered therein is stronger than the vessel containing it; that the Jew who speaks and acts, preaches and prophesies therein, represents the interests and principles of humanity. When the Book of Books was handed forth to the world, it was offered, in the words of God to Abraham, to be a blessing to all families of man on earth. It was to give man one God, one hope, and one goal and destiny.

We can easily discern the broadening influence of classical culture exercised upon the Jews that spoke and wrote in Greek. Under the invigorating breeze of the philosophy of Alexandria, Moses was made to teach in the manner of Plato, and Noah and Abraham to practice all the virtues of Pythagoras. Philo, Josephus, and St. Paul endeavored alike to batter down the walls separating Greek from Jew, the unwritten laws of Athens being identified with the Noachian laws of humanity, the practice of which opened

the gates of eternal bliss for the Gentile as well as for the Jew. All the more stress I lay on the claim that only the monotheistic faith of the Bible established the bonds of human brotherhood. It was the consciousness of God's indwelling in man, or the Biblical teaching of man being God's child, that rendered humanity one.

Even though the golden rule has been found in Confucius as well as in Buddha, in Plato as in Socrates, it never engendered true love of man as brother and fellow-worker among their people beyond their own small circles. The Chinese sage, with his sober realism, never felt nor fostered the spirit of self-surrender to a great cause beyond his own state and ruler; and if the monk Gautama succeeded by his preaching on the world's vanities, in bridling the passions and softening the temper of millions, planting love and compassion into every soul throughout the East, and dotting the lands with asylums and hospitals for the rescue of man and beast, he also checked the progress of man, while loathing life as misery without comfort, as a burden of woe without hope of relief, dissolving it into a purposeless dream, an illusion evanescent into nothing. And what were, after all, the great achievements and efforts of man, to the proud Greek, if the rulers of heaven only looked down with envy upon their creation. And Prometheus, the friend of man, had to undergo endless torture for life as a penalty for having stolen the spark of fire, the secret of art for the mortals, from the jealous gods. Neither Pindar nor Plato ever conceived of a divine plan of the doings of man. No Thucydides nor Herodotus ever inquired after the beginnings and ends of human history or traced the various people back to one cradle and one offspring. Not until Alexander the Macedonian with his conquests interlinked the East and the West, did the idea of humanity loom up before the minds of the cultured, as it did before Judea's sages and seers. Only when antiquity's pride was lowered to the dust, and philosopher and priest found their strength exhausted, man, suffering, sorrowing, weeping, sought refuge from the approaching storm, yearning for fellowship and brotherhood in the common woe and misery of a world shattered within and without. But then neither the Stoic,

in his overbearing pride and self-admiration, nor the Cynic, with his contemptuous sneer, could make life worth living.

It was the Bible, offered first by Jew, then by Christian, and, in somewhat modified tones, by Moslem, that gave man, with the benign Ruler of the ages, also a common scope and plan, a common prospect and hope. While to the Greek—from whom we have borrowed the very name of ethics—goodness, righteousness, virtue, were objects of admiration, like any bit of nature and art, beautiful and pleasing, and life itself a plaything, the Bible made life, with all its efforts, solemn and sacred, a divine reality. Here at once men rose to be co-workers with God, the successive ages became stages of the world's great drama, each country, each home, each soul, an object of divine care, each man an image of the Divine Father. True enough, this conception of the God-likeness of man is as much Platonic or Pythagorean as it is Biblical. Still there the relation is all one-sided. There is no more mutual response in the Greek system than there is between the strings of the musical instrument and the great orchestra, between the citizen and the law of the state. There no deep calls to the deep, no spirit answers the spirit. Man follows the magnetic pole of the right and the good, but lacks courage to fling fear and fate to the wind and take fast hold of life, with all its tears and sorrows, trusting in a great God who leads man through toil and trial to ever higher paths of righteousness and goodness. It was the Bible which, holding God up to mankind as the pattern of a great worker for truth and justice, furnished life with a living ideal, with a propelling power, a forward-moving force, rendering man a toiler after the likeness of God for living aims and lasting purposes. Take the word Goodness in Plato. It is not the outflow of a paternal heart that finds blessedness in love. It is a fountain that works beneficently, but knows it not. Take the Platonic term Righteousness. It is a plan of equity and symmetry that rounds off every thing to perfection in the wide universe, yet not a power that enriches while taking, that comforts while exacting and demanding sacrifice. The Biblical idea of God's Fatherhood renders the very inequalities of men the basis of a higher justice. Just

because you are endowed with a strong arm, the feeble brother claims your help. Just because you are richer than your brother, God holds you to account for his wants and feelings. Do you possess a better faith, a higher truth? All the more you are enjoined to enlighten, to cheer, to befriend him who is in doubt and despair.

There is no partiality with God. The weaker member in the human household, therefore, must be treated with greater compassion and love, and every inequality readjusted as far as our powers reach, "If thou seest one in distress, ask not who he is. Even though he be thine enemy, he is still thy brother, appeals to thy sympathy; thou canst not hide thine eyes; I, thy God, see thee." Can, alongside of this Mosaic law, the question be yet asked, Who is my neighbor? Thou mayst not love him because he hateth thee. Yet, as fellow-man, thou must put thyself into his place, and thou darest no longer harm nor hate him. Even if he be a criminal, he is thy brother still, claiming sympathy and leniency. Sinner or stranger, slave or sufferer, skeptic or saint, he is son of the same Father in Heaven. The God who hath once redeemed thee will also redeem him.

Are these the principles and maxims of the New Testament? I read them in the Old. I learned them from the Talmud. I found their faint echo in the Koran. The Merciful One of Mohammed enjoins charity and compassion no less than does the Holy One of Isaiah, and the heavenly Father of Jesus. We have been too rash, too harsh, too uncharitable, in judging other sects and creeds. "We men judge nations and classes too often only by the bad examples they produce; God judges them by their best and noblest types," is an exquisite saying of the Rabbis. Is there a race or a religion that does not cultivate one great virtue to unlock the gates of bliss for all its followers? Hear the Psalmist exclaim: "This is the gate of the Lord, the righteous enter into it." No priest nor Levite nor Israel's people enjoy any privilege there. The kind Samaritan, as Jesus puts it in his parable; the good and just among all men, as the Rabbis express it (*Sifra Aḥre Mot*, 13), find admission. No monopoly of salvation for any creed. Righteousness opens the door for all the nations. Is this platform not

broad enough to hold every creed? Must not every system of ethics find a place in this great brotherhood, with whatever virtue or ideal it emphasizes? Is there not scope given for every honest endeavor and each human craving, for whatever cheers and inspires, ennobles and refines man, for every vocation, profession, or skill; for whatever lifts dust-born man to higher standards of goodness, to higher states of blessedness?

Too long, indeed, have Chinese walls, reared by nations and sects, kept man from his brother, to rend humanity asunder. Will the principles of toleration suffice? Or shall Lessing's parable of the three rings plead for equality of Church, Mosque, and Synagogue? What, then, about the rest of the creeds, the great Parliament of Religions? And what a poor plea for the father, if, from love, he cheats his children, to find at the end he has but cheated himself of their love. No. Either all the rings are genuine and have the magic power of love, or the father is himself a fraud. Truth and Love, in order to enrich and uplift, must be firm and immutable, as God himself. If truth, love, and justice be the goal, they must be my fellowman's as well as mine. And should not every act and step of man and humanity lead onward to Zion's hill, which shall stand high above all mounts of vision and aspiration, above every single truth and knowledge, faith and hope, the mountain of the Lord? There, high above all the mists of human longings, the infinite glory of Him dwells, whom angels with covered faces sing as the Thrice Holy, and whom all mortals praise as the God of Truth—El Emet, as the Rabbis put it; Aleph, the beginning, Mem, the middle, and Tav, the end—Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.

I

THE HARMONIZATION OF THE JEWISH AND CIVIL LAWS OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

INTRODUCTION

THE subject which has been assigned to me for discussion has been before this Conference for a number of years under this or some similar title. Upon a motion made in 1907 by Rabbi Abram Simon at the Frankfort convention, a resolution was adopted that 'in view of the disparity between some of the Mosaic and rabbinical marriage laws on the one hand, and the theories, laws and practices prevalent in our country, a Committee be appointed to prepare a complete review and comparison of the same with the special purpose in view to guide the reform rabbi in his religious and civic practices.' In the following year the Committee, with Rabbi Rosenau as Chairman, proposed: "A division of labor among the members before a basis for a method of harmonization could be arrived at," while at the same convention a paper on Intermarriage was read by Rabbi Mendel Silver. In 1909, at the New York convention, the intermarriage question was discussed in two papers, one by the late Prof. Feldman from the historical, and another by Rabbi Schulman from the theological, point of view, and, after a lengthy debate, a resolution was adopted declaring that 'mixed marriages are contrary to the tradition of the Jewish religion and should, therefore, be discouraged by the American rabbis.' At the Charlevoix convention, in 1910, the Committee, with Rabbi Frisch as Chairman, reiterated the proposal of a division of labor, while suggesting papers to be written on the Status of Woman, legal and social; on Prohibited Marriages and Remarriage; also papers by Jewish lawyers representing the legal point of view, such as the one written by B. H. Hartogensis, of Baltimore, on Jewish Marriages and American Law, and read at the Baltimore convention.

At the Atlantic City convention in 1913, the modern problem of the Jewish marriage and divorce laws was discussed in a paper by Rabbi J. Leonard Levy, of Pittsburgh, and Rabbi Leon Harrison, of St. Louis, while the Committee, through its Chairman, Rabbi J. Leonard Levy, offered a number of recommendations concerning rabbinical and State divorces and marriage and re-marriage which were referred to the Executive Board for action. Last year, at the Detroit convention, Rabbi Silverman, as Chairman of the Committee, reported briefly on four important topics: 1. On rabbinical divorce; 2. On national marriage and divorce laws; 3. On eugenic laws; 4. On forbidden marriages; but no action was taken by the Conference.

Obviously, amidst the continual change of the members constituting the Committee, the subject, so pre-eminently important for the modern Jew, as it involves the purity and sacredness of the home and the welfare of the race, has thus far failed to receive the serious and thorough investigation and discussion which it imperatively demands.

True, the complexity of its nature and the many problems it presents make it exceedingly difficult for any single member of the rabbinate to treat it exhaustively or even satisfactorily. Still the matter is too urgent to allow further delay, and to each of us comes the appeal: לא עליך המלאכה, לגמור ולא אתה בן חורין ליבטל ממנה, 'it is not incumbent upon thee to complete the task, yet thou art not at liberty to desist from it.' Particularly as the representative exponent of Progressive American Judaism ought this Conference of American rabbis take a clear and definite stand on all the grave questions at issue in order to offer substantial and, I trust, also valuable aid in the contemplated undertaking of furnishing the American people with the long-looked-for Uniform Code of Marriage and Divorce Laws.

CONSERVATIVE JUDAISM AND THE CIVIL MARRIAGE LAWS

In using the term Progressive Judaism, I fully realize that the conservative rabbi is also confronted and at times perplexed by new problems arising from the changed condi-

tions and environments. His absolute adherence, however, to Talmudic law and tradition as fixed by the accepted codes forbids him to surrender any of the rabbinical statutes in favor of the law of the State, and hence a harmonization of the religious and civil laws is for him out of the question. All he can do is to have a double code of laws, the one of the religious and the other of the State laws, side by side, no matter how inconsistent his mode of action be. Such was indeed, the standpoint taken by the Napoleonic Sanhedrin, in 1807, when, in response to the question whether intermarriages are permitted in Judaism, they declared that "marriages between Christians and Jews are from a civil point of view valid and binding and, although such marriages cannot be invested with religious forms, they shall not entail any anathema (*Herem*)."

Less known, but just as important and characteristic are the two declarations preceding this, which read as follows: "Article I, on Polygamy: While polygamy is permitted in the Mosaic law, the Israelites of the Occident have, in conformity with the civil laws of the states in which they lived from the early times of their dispersion, generally renounced the same, and the Synod of Worms under the presidency of Rabbi Gershom, in 1030 of the Christian Era, pronounced an anathema upon any Israelite marrying more than one wife. Polygamous marriages are thus rarely found among the Israelites of the European continent. Consequently the Grand Sanhedrin, realizing the importance of the maintenance of this general custom of the European Israelites and in confirmation of said decision of the Synod of Worms as a religious precept, declares that in all the states where polygamy is prohibited by the civil law, particularly in those of the French empire and the Italian kingdom, every Israelite is forbidden to marry a second wife during the lifetime of his first wife, unless a divorce from the latter, pronounced in conformity with the regulations of the civil code and followed by a religious divorce, has dissolved the marriage bond. Article II, on Divorce: In consideration of the necessary harmony between the Hebrew customs regarding marriage and the civil laws of France and Italy on the same subject to which, also, the religious principle

demands submission, the Grand Sanhedrin declares that the divorce permitted by the law of Moses is valid only when it effects an absolute dissolution of all the ties binding the two persons in question together; also from the point of view of the civil law, since, according to the civil code which governs the Israelites as French and Italian citizens, no divorce is consummated unless decreed by the civil court, the Mosaic divorce lacks the force of a complete dissolution of the marriage bond. Wherefore the Grand Sanhedrin, by virtue of its authority, also makes it a religious ordinance that henceforth no divorce should be given according to the form established by the Mosaic law except after the marriage has been dissolved by a competent civil court, according to the forms prescribed by the civil code. It should also be expressly forbidden to any rabbi within those states to lend his service to the granting of a divorce without having the civil divorce decree in good form presented to him; otherwise any rabbi who permits himself to infringe upon the present religious statute should be regarded as unworthy for the future of performing his ministerial function."

In the answers formulated the year before by Rabbi David Zinzheimer on behalf of the Assembly of Jewish Notables, special reference is made to the Talmudic principles: "The law of the state is supreme law," and the Code Eben Ha Ezer (Ch. 137) demanding an absolute dissolution of the marriage bond by the *Get*. In regard to mixed marriages the Talmudic view that the Mosaic prohibition refers only to idolatrous nations, if not exclusively to the seven Canaanite tribes, is maintained and the modern nations declared to be monotheists, the only obstacle to the marriage of such being found 'in the religious ceremony which separates Jews from Christians exactly as the same separates Catholics from non-Catholics, and therefore can be as little performed by the rabbi in the one case as by the priests in the other.'

Thus at the very entrance of the Jew into modern life, the possibility of a harmonization of the religious and the civil laws of marriage and divorce became a question of

great importance, but it was solved rather evasively by the conservative rabbis.

The same conservative view, only more outspoken, is taken for English Jewry by M. Friedlander in his work, *The Jewish Religion* (London, 1891, p. 488f.), where he writes: "We acknowledge the principle laid down in the Talmud: 'The law of the country is binding upon us,' דינא דמלכותא דינא, but only in so far as our civil relations are concerned. With regard to religious questions our own religious code must be obeyed. Marriage laws include two elements, civil relations and religious duties. As regards the former, we abide by the decision of the civil courts of the country. We must, therefore, not solemnize a marriage which the law of the country would not recognize; we must not religiously dissolve a marriage by *Get* unless the civil courts of law have already decreed the divorce. On the other hand, we must not content ourselves with civil marriage nor civil divorce. Religiously neither civil marriage nor civil divorce can be recognized unless supplemented by marriage or divorce according to religious forms. Furthermore, marriages allowed by the civil law but prohibited by our religious law, e. g., mixed marriages, that is, marriages between Jews and non-Jews cannot be recognized before the tribunal of our religion. Such alliances are sinful and the issue of such alliances must be treated as illegitimate." Likewise does D. W. Amram in an article on *The Jewish Law and the Law of the State in Matters of Divorce*, in the *American Hebrew* (1903, p. 179), insist that the *Get* follow the State bill of divorce in every case, even when the husband's assent is not obtained, pointing to Talmudic decisions in similar cases where there is danger lest the woman remain in a state of helpless isolation (*'Agunah*). It is not necessary to mention other difficulties arising from the conflict between the State and the Jewish laws of marriage also among the conservatives, of which Mr. Hartogensis, of Baltimore, spoke in a paper on *Rhode Island and the Jewish Consanguineous Marriage Laws*, read before the American Jewish Historical Society.²

PROGRESSIVE JUDAISM AND THE MARRIAGE LAWS

The real question of harmonization of the religious and civil laws of marriage and divorce can come up for consideration only from the viewpoint of Progressive or Reform Judaism,³ which recognized the process of growth and development in religion and law, whether Mosaic or rabbinical. Here the question at issue is, how far are the Mosaic-Talmudic and how far are the State laws in accord with our religious and moral consciousness today? It was Abraham Geiger's epoch-making article on *The Position of Woman in Modern Judaism*, in his *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* of 1837 (p. 1-14), that gave the first impulse to reforms in this field. There he urged the abolition of rites and practices which degrade woman, and are based upon the antiquated oriental view that she is a mere chattel bought by man and, at his own pleasure or displeasure, disowned by him, or, in case of his death, transferred to another. Referring to Rabbenu Gershom's endeavor for the assertion of the principle of monogamy for the European Jewry, he demands similar efforts for the abrogation of usages contrary to the spirit of modern civilization, claiming that the Talmudic rule: *כל המקדש אדעתא דרבנן מקדש* 'Whosoever contracts a marriage, does it in full agreement with the rabbinical authorities,' by dint of which marriages that were liable to lead to evil moral or social consequences for the wife were annulled by the rabbis, empowered also the modern rabbis to do the same when the civil court dissolves a marriage either by a decree of divorce or by declaring the husband or wife who had been missing for a number of years to be dead in the eyes of the law. A far bolder and more radical stand was taken by Samuel Holdheim in *Die Autonomie der Rabbinen und das Princip der juedischen Ehe*, 1843. Here the entire Mosaic and Talmudic law concerning marriage is rejected as being based upon the ancient Jewish state and nation, which are gone forever, and absolute validity claimed only for the modern state law. It matters not whether the Talmudic maxim: "The law of the state is law also for the Jew" is correctly, or, as was shown by Samson Raphael Hirsch and

afterwards by Leopold Loew,⁴ falsely applied to marriage laws, the principle that the Jewish marriage laws have no religious character and must give way to the laws of the state henceforth formed the basis of all further reform measures. True, the rather hasty endorsement by the rabbinical conference of Brunswick, in 1844,⁵ of the above mentioned three articles of the Napoleonic Sanhedrin, which were not even correctly presented by Ludwig Philippson in his motion, and especially the resolution passed by a small plurality, declaring that mixed marriages are not prohibited, provided the parents are permitted by the state law to raise the children in the Israelitish religion, retarded rather than promoted the reform movement. The proposed revision of all the Jewish marriage laws for which a committee, with Dr. Geiger as chairman, had been appointed, was taken up neither at the Frankfort nor at the Breslau Conference of 1845 and 1846. Of course, during the reaction which followed the year 1848, the reform movement rested until the Leipzig and Augsburg Synod of 1869 and 1871 resumed the work under the leadership of Aub and Geiger. There important resolutions were passed, one ascribing 'full validity and sanction to civil marriages, provided the Mosaic prohibitions be not transgressed'; another recognizing the legal decision of the civil court declaring a missing person as dead; a third one, allowing a widow who has been left with a young child to re-marry after the lapse of one year after her husband's death, and, under certain circumstances, also before that time; a fourth one, abrogating the Talmudic laws concerning marriages with proselytes as having no reference to converts from the midst of any of the Christian sects; a fifth one, abrogating *Halizah* and declaring the whole Levirate law to be foreign to our religious and social consciousness; a sixth one, doing away with the custom forbidding marriages on certain unlucky days of the year; and finally, one which came up first for discussion and characterized the half-hearted reform spirit of the Synod, declaring that 'it is permissible at the marriage ceremony after the bridegroom has given the bride the ring with the usual formula: "Be consecrated to me" to have also the bride hand the bridegroom a ring with some

corresponding words.' In other words, it was left optional with the bride whether she would take an active part in this important step or not. The divorce question was handed over to a commission to report to the next Synod, which, however, never took place.⁶ We see here again the same dualism of law which is maintained by the conservatives adhered to in most questions. A real harmonization of the civil and religious laws, or, let us rather say, of the religious life and modern consciousness of the Jew was and is not to be attained in Europe under present conditions.

AMERICAN REFORM JUDAISM

Quite different were matters at the very outset in free America where the ancient form of tradition has not the strong hold upon the people as in the old world. The first important step toward according to the Jewish woman an equal place in religious life as to man, was taken by Isaac M. Wise in Albany when, besides having female singers in the choir, he introduced family pews into the synagogue in 1851, following the example of the church. It was, as he says in his *Reminiscences*, an act of emancipation of the Jewish woman in America. The principle of equality of man and woman in wedlock was afterwards fully expressed in the resolutions concerning marriage and divorce adopted on the motion of David Einhorn and with the hearty support of Isaac M. Wise at the Philadelphia Conference of 1869. The first of these declared that the bride shall no longer take merely a passive part in the marriage ceremony, but there shall be a mutual self-consecration of both bridegroom and bride expressed in the same marriage formula: "Be consecrated to me as wife (resp. husband) according to the law of God" and accompanied by the handing of a ring to each other. Another one demands, in place of traditional *Birkat Erusin*, the character of which is offensive to our sense of propriety, a benediction expressive of the high moral character of wedlock and of the Biblical idea of the union of man and woman into *one* personality, which implies mutual fidelity. Still more expressive of the modern spirit are the resolutions con-

cerning divorce and re-marriage, of which the one declares divorce to be also from the Mosaic and rabbinical point of view only a civil act devoid of any religious character, and, therefore, valid only when it proceeds from the civil courts, whereas the so-called ritual *Get* is in all cases invalid and ineffective. Only as a precaution against abuses and infringement upon the ethical principles of Judaism, investigation of the judicial reasons for granting the divorce is recommended to the rabbi before re-marriage. The decision as to re-marriage is, in cases of the disappearance of husband or wife for a long time, also left to the law of the land. Furthermore were the laws concerning the marriages prohibited to the Aaronites as well as the one regarding *Halizah* declared as void of all significance and binding force for us.⁷ All these and the previously mentioned resolutions were embodied in the Yearbook of the Cleveland convention (1890, pp. 95-120), having been adopted the year before by the Central Conference of American Rabbis at the constitution of the same in Detroit, as stated on page 4 of the same Yearbook.

Now, while we possess an excellent and almost indispensable digest in *The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce in Ancient and Modern Times and Its relation to the Law of the State*, written by Moses Mielziner, as Chairman of a committee appointed by the Rabbinical Literary Association of America, upon the motion of Max Lilienthal, its president, 'to collect the historical and literary material pertaining to the subject,' we find it, as is the case with all human products after a certain time, no longer adequate to our requirements. Like Z. Frankel and Leopold Loew, whom he frequently quotes, he was too much engrossed in his Talmuic studies to take full cognizance of other views concerning the marriage rites. He was, in fact, only engaged in the work of registering and summarizing former decisions and opinions, and could not be expected to present original researches on the subject. Least of all was he prepared or disposed to favor any abrogation or even modification of the Mosaic laws on the prohibited degrees or incestuous marriages, such as a number of our younger rabbis would propose today. He rather favored compromises such as

he offered in the Cleveland convention in his Marriage Agenda, when he re-introduced the objectionable *Birkat Erusin* in Hebrew alongside of an altogether different English benediction.⁸

THE POINTS TO BE CONSIDERED

In order, then, to arrive independently at clear and positive views on all the pending questions, it is necessary for us to consider in the light of history the following points:

1. The status of woman, social, legal and religious, in the past and present.
2. The character, the object, and the corresponding form of marriage.
3. The dissolution of marriage.
 - a—by divorce.
 - b—by death.
4. Prevention of marriage.
 - a—Prohibited marriages.
 - b—Personal impediments.
 - c—Temporary impediments.
5. Civil marriages in their relation to Judaism.

I

The most superficial glance at the ethnological facts concerning marriage, for which Westermarck's History of Human Marriage, is the acknowledged authority, shows that it is the status of woman which determines the character and view of marriage. The higher the civilization, the higher will be the position of woman in society and the nobler will be the view of marriage. Now we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the legal status of woman was fixed for ancient Israel, and hence for Mosaic and Rabbinic Judaism, by the laws of the Code of Hammurabi, the Babylonian ruler at the time of Abraham, which became the common law of the then civilized world and fashioned more or less the practices of all adjoining tribes. However high in the esteem and love of the individual the wife, the mother or sister stood, or the prophetess or wise woman in

the estimate of the nation, as a woman she lacked everything that constitutes a free personality. While only the name *nasa ishak* (to carry a wife) indicates an original wife-capture of which the Benjamin story in Judges XXI preserved a trace, the wife-purchase as expressed in the term *lakah ishak* was still practised in Biblical times (see Hosea III, 1 and 2), the *Mohar* being originally the purchase price given to the father (Comp. I Sam. XVIII, 25) for which years of servitude, as in the case of Jacob, was a substitute. The woman was a piece of property owned by the father or brother and acquired by the husband; and, as is shown in Ruth IV, 10, as well as in the Deuteronomic law of the Levirate (XXV, 5ff.) in case of death of the latter, she is transferred as chattel to the next heir, unless she has a son to take the place of the father. She has no will of her own, hence either her father or her husband can annul her vow (Num. XXX, 6-9). It is perfectly true that in her social position and influence she was far superior to her sister throughout the East or in Greece where she was locked up in the rear of the home. She was indeed 'man's helpmate,' as the Genesis story tells and as the story of Abigail (I Sam. XXV), or the Book of Proverbs, especially the song of the 'virtuous woman,' described her. Yet both polygamy, though rare among the middle classes, and the general contempt of the barren wife kept woman more or less in a state of subjection.

Nor did the rabbinical law elevate her position despite the most beautiful ethical teachings contained in the Talmud or the Book of Sira concerning the worth, the hallowing, and ennobling influence of woman, or the high respect due to her.⁹ According to the Talmud, which still rules Jewish life in any legal transaction and also in the marriage contract, no woman's testimony is valid and her signature upon any legal document is worthless.¹⁰ The wedding ring given her by the bridegroom is, in the opinion of the rabbis, not a mere symbol, but the actual purchase price, however small, (*Perutah*) with which she is formally bought, and it is at the husband's pleasure that she may be divorced. Thus she has actually remained a piece of property of the husband in the eyes of the law, however

many palliative measures the rabbis have, in the course of time, taken to restrain the absolute power of the husband over her. She is in the view of the Talmud, even when highly esteemed and cherished, not a high end to herself, but a vessel, a child bearer.¹¹ Woe to her, if she fails in this. If, after ten years of marriage, she gives her husband no children, she must, says the Rabbinical Code, yield her place to another wife, either, where polygamy prevails, to have a rival at her side or, in monogamous countries, to be divorced. Only the last few centuries have become more humane in this respect.¹² Nor is she counted among the ten persons constituting a congregation for divine service or for any religious purpose.¹³

It is always the woman that causes man to sin and lust after her, wherefore she must, according to the rabbinical law, hide her hair and suppress her voice of song in the presence of man, lest he be led to lewdness and evil thought.¹⁴

No wonder if woman was believed to stand nearer to the temptation of the serpent or Satan, and that the Jew, like the Greek and Persian, felt called upon to thank the Creator every morning that he was not made a woman.¹⁵ Enough, we cannot consistently tolerate practises which have this low oriental view of woman as their basis. We must insist upon the equality of man and woman, especially at the marriage ceremony, and just as the bridegroom gives the ring to the bride to wear as a symbol of union for life, so should the bride hand one to the bridegroom. Conversely, a woman should be regarded as equally fit as witness at the ceremony as man if she wishes to function as such.

II

CHARACTER, FORM AND OBJECT OF MARRIAGE

Marriage bears, from the beginning, in all civilizations and at all times, a two-fold character. As far as society at large is concerned, it is a *legal* contract; as far as it relates to the individual and the home, it has, in some way or other, a *religious* character. This ethnological fact has not been sufficiently considered by our Jewish scholars who are

more or less influenced by the Talmudic sources and codes. The Mishnaic statute, (Kiddushin I), declaring that the woman is acquired as property either by money, or by a written document, or by the cohabitation act, states simply the *legal* view of *Kiddushin*—betrothal, termed also *Erusin*, corresponding to the original Anglo-Saxon, *Bewettung* (wedding), that is, wife-purchase, which was followed later by the nuptials (*Nisuin*), called after the Anglo-saxon usage *Gifta* (*giving away the bride*). And it was chiefly at the *home-bringing of the bride* that the religious character of the marriage expressed itself originally in rites performed either at the Aryan fireside or at the Semitic threshold, as the sacred spot of the home, with the view of binding the new mistress to the guardian spirits or guardianship of the same. In the one case, the bride was led around the fire, in the other carried over the threshold, while, at the same time, some food or drink was offered both bridegroom and bride amidst sacrifices by way of a covenant.¹⁶ Some such religious rite the Biblical sources have in view when, speaking of the marriage covenant as a divine bond, (Prov. II, 17,) Malachi II, 14,) and when Ezekiel (Ch. XVI), in describing the espousal of Israel by the Lord, speaks again and again of the marriage covenant as a special hallowing act. So does also Hosea (II, 21–22). It is this symbolic act of union of God and Israel which the closing words of the *Birkat Erusin* (*Ketubot* 7b), as well as Paul, in the Ephesians V, 32, have in view. A similar allusion to the same is made in the Karaite marriage act (see *Eshkol ha Kofer* 11d). Both the ring and the wine, or some kind of drink or food, have from time immemorial in various countries been used as symbols of the marriage covenant.¹⁶ And while, in Talmudic and pre-Talmudic times down to the middle ages, the bridegroom recited, before entering the bridal chamber (*Huppah*),¹⁷ the benediction¹⁸ which is rather objectionable to us, it has wisely been made the general custom to have the minister, who officiated as the representative of religion, solemnize the marriage by the recital of the benedictions and the proper admonition.

Yet since each religion has its peculiar traditional forms, the modern rabbi ought not to adopt the forms or formulas

of any of the Christian Churches and have the bridegroom or bride use such words as: "With this ring I thee wed" or: "I take thee to be my wedded wife, respectively, husband," or lay special stress on the varied symbolisms of the ring which played during the middle ages and still play¹⁹ an especial role in the church, but adhere instead to the traditional Jewish formula: "Be consecrated unto me by the law of God" (and if he wishes he may add, "And according to the sacred custom of Israel"). Instead of dwelling on the commonplace wisdom concerning the endlessness of the ring as symbolizing eternity, he would act more wisely if he would instead comment on the cup of wine he offers to the bridal couple as symbolizing the cup of destiny from which they will henceforth draw joy and sorrow in common, and which they can both sweeten by loving devotion. Also the benediction referring to the creation of woman as the helpmate of man and their destiny to form *one* personality, which has been in use as early as the second pre-Christian century, as is learned from Tobit (l. c.), should have its place in our modern marriage ceremony.

The fundamental Jewish conception of marriage is, that it is a sacred ordinance of God established in nature, but not, as the church rendered it on account of the term *mystery* in the Epistle to Ephesians V, 32, a sacrament. Nor is it merely an antidote against, or concession to, human sensuality and lust, as the mediaeval church regarded it from her view-point of asceticism and abstinence. Celibacy, controlled by the church and demanded of the priest and the laic saint, is deprecated and condemned by Judaism, which required its high priests of yore to have a wife when performing the great atonement rite on Yom Ha Kippurim. Later on, also, the occupant of the Reader's office in the solemn days of penitence had to be married.²⁰ Naturally, the procreation of offspring is the main object of the matrimonial union in the eyes of ancient Judaism, as the divine blessing: "Increase and multiply and fill the earth" (Gen. I, 28), is taken to be the first of the 613 commandments of the Torah. Of course, the hope for a progeny was frequently expressed in popular customs, as for instance, in the casting of rice on the couple. Nor was it only in the Jewish law

that barrenness was considered sufficient cause for divorce.²¹ All the more it is desirable that the modern marriage ceremony should accentuate, in appropriate language, the higher object of the matrimonial union, and that is the communion of life for the performance of such duties and for aspirations after such ideals as are of transcendent value to humanity at large, a union of souls which is an end to itself and which should be perennial, no matter whether the same is blessed by children or not.

Another point is to be touched upon in this connection. The church, while dwelling on the words spoken to Eve: "And he shall rule over thee," wants the bride to pledge herself to *obey* as well as to *love* her husband. This state of submission of the wife, which was frequently symbolized in pagan and Christian Rome as well as in Jewish and other oriental circles by the covering or cutting of the hair (Compare I Corinth. 11, 5-14), was never accentuated in the Jewish law or liturgy. On the contrary, by the ethical teachings of the rabbis she was ever spoken of as an object of man's esteem and honor.²²

Both husband and wife have a sphere of their own in which they should rule. The outside world with its social obligations is man's, the domestic life, woman's. And only mutual understanding and mutual consideration should guide each and not obsequiousness and lordliness.

III

THE DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE

(a) DIVORCE.

While the solemnization of marriage has, as we have seen, normally the character of both a legal or civil and a religious act, the dissolution can by its nature only be a legal act, over which the genius of religion can only weep as over a broken-down sanctuary. As R. Eleazar says:²³ "He who divorces his first wife, for him the altar of God sheds tears, for thus says Malachi (II, 13f): 'Ye cover the altar of God with tears, weeping and sighing * * *. I hate

the putting away of the wife of thy covenant, saith the Lord.'” How different from other laws, such as the Mohammedan, which recognized as legal any form of repudiation of the wife, however arbitrary and dictated by momentary impulses of passion or caprice, is the Deuteronomic law (XXIV, 1), which prescribes, or, more correctly, assumes as established custom (see Jerem. III, 8 and Isa. L, 1) the ‘handing of a written bill of divorce to her’ as the legal procedure. In later times a document ensuring to the wife at her wedding a dowry in case of death or divorce, the *Ketubah* ascribed to R. Simeon ben Shetaḥ, but mentioned already in Tobit 7, 14, put a check to hasty divorce.²⁴ In the course of time the many minute prescriptions concerning the form of divorce document and its delivery by the rabbis further retarded and restrained the husband’s action.

The principle underlying the Biblical and rabbinical marriage and divorce laws, which rests upon the oriental view inherent in polygamy that man owns his wife and can therefore send her away at pleasure, while she can not divorce him, was gradually so modified by the rabbis as to concede to her certain rights in contracting and dissolving marriage to enable her to assert her claims as if she were his equal. “It was,” says Amram, (*The Jewish Law of Divorce* p. 60) “by means of a legal fiction that the theory of the husband’s exclusive right to give the divorce was apparently maintained, while the divorce given by him under order of the court was as much a judicial divorce as any modern proceeding of such nature.” Cases in which women divorced their husbands in Herodian times, recorded by Josephus (*Ant.* XV, 7, 10 and XVIII, 5, 4), were simply violations of the Jewish law. The rabbis, however, found a way of redress for the wife in case of maltreatment, or of having forced upon her undignified behavior, or of refusal of her conjugal rights by her husband, or of impotence and loathsome diseases, or of malodorous occupations on his part, or in case she fails to have children (*Yeb.* 65b, E. H. CLIV, 6). This is done by forcing him to give her a bill of divorce together with her dowry,²⁵ on the ground that he failed to treat her “in accordance with the law of Moses and Israel,” as he promised when marrying her.²⁶ Only

under the influence of occidental civilization, R. Gershom of Mayence of the XI century, while putting an end to polygamy in European Jewry, established also the right of the wife in divorce cases by pronouncing an anathema upon anyone divorcing his wife against her will.²⁷ But there is another essential difference between the Jewish divorce law and that of our modern State law, and that is of far greater significance. According to the Mosaic-Talmudic law, adultery is exclusively the breaking of the marriage vow on the part of the wife and him who has sexual intercourse with her, and this adultery is punished by the death of both. The married man who breaks his marriage vow by having sexual intercourse with an unmarried woman is a sinner, but not an adulterer. In the former case, the husband cannot condone his wife's guilt but must divorce her. In the latter case, the woman cannot compel the husband to dissolve the matrimonial bond, unless he is an habitual debauchee against whom she can bring a suit in court.²⁸ Otherwise she has to remain his wife, unless he neglects his conjugal duties towards her.

Furthermore, the husband is, according to the Jewish law, his own judge as to the cause sufficient for divorcing his wife. True, the Deuteronomic law (XXIV, 1) states as the cause for divorce that "He has found some matter of nakedness—*Ervat Dabar*—in her," which means some improper act, but not actual faithlessness.²⁹ The Shammaite school, however, as did the Sadducees and do the Karaites, understood the term as a shameless act in the sense of faithlessness, identifying the term with *Debar Ervah*—a matter of an incestuous nature. The Hillelites, on the contrary, whose view, however, has not been accepted by the Halakah,³⁰ took the word after Deut. XXIII, 15, in the sense of 'something unseemly,' that is, anything that he finds objectionable, even if it is only that 'she burnt the meal for him,' or, as R. Akiba says: "Even when he found a woman fairer than she, whom he wishes to marry instead."³¹ This view is taken also by Philo and Josephus as the generally accepted one.³² Whether the underlying idea was that when affection is gone, domestic peace and harmony are also undermined, as some would explain

it, or not, needs not be discussed here. No doubt, we find the Shammaite view a far higher one. Thus does indeed the New Testament make divorce conditional upon her faithlessness, when Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount is made to say: "I say to you that whoever shall put his wife away for the cause of fornication, causes her to commit adultery."³³ Now while, in the course of time, the Christian church opposed divorce altogether upon the ground that Jesus declared: "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder," and, "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another commits adultery against her and if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she commits adultery,"³⁴ the Jewish law left to her husband the right to divorce his wife at pleasure, without granting her any reciprocal rights unless she could sue him for exceptional causes to obtain divorce from him.

This oriental view of the husband's exclusive power is certainly no longer shared by us. Of course, we are equally opposed to the view taken by the Christian church and Catholic state laws that admits no dissolution of the marriage bond, even in the case of adultery, except by papal dispensation. This inhibition of the dissolution of matrimony has, as statistics show in all Catholic countries, frequently led and still leads to dissoluteness on the part of both husband and wife. Moreover, as Frankel (*Grundlinien*, XLIII) has aptly put it: "Whatever undermines the domestic peace should be accepted as sufficient cause for divorce."

Indeed, in the reaction against the entire church view which, on the one hand, declared the marriage to be a sacrament and therefore indissoluble, and, on the other hand, bargaining with the papal dispensations, as in other matters, looked upon marriage as a mere concession to the flesh and an indulgence of sensuality—saner and soberer views of the matrimonial state and its problems came into vogue in Protestant countries. The whole process of the ecclesiastical, the Protestant, and modern divorce law is exhaustively presented in Bishop's *History of Matrimonial Institutions*. There the reader may learn what enormous difficulties both the jurist and the moralist encounter in

matters of divorce. This much, however, is certain, that there is nothing religious in divorce. Nor could the formula: *כדת משה וישראל* embodied in the Jewish divorce bill (*Get*)³⁵ make it in anyway Jewish in a religious sense. It was, therefore, quite logical and correct when the Philadelphia Conference declared that 'the so-called ritual *Get* has no validity whatsoever for us, and that the civil court is the only legal authority for us to grant a bill of divorce.' But the second paragraph of the resolution in question is open to objections. It reads as follows: "The dissolution of marriage by a civil court is also valid in the eyes of Judaism if it can be ascertained from the judicial documents that both parties have given their consent to the divorce. Where, however, the court issues a decree against one or the other party by constraint, Judaism recognizes the validity of the divorce only where the cause is found sufficient in accordance with the spirit of the Jewish religion. It is recommended, however, that the rabbi who is to officiate at the re-marriage of any of the two parties, obtain the concurrence of competent colleagues." Obviously this clause was framed with the view of complying with the decision of Rabbenu Gershom: "That the wife must be equally willing to dissolve the marriage bond."³⁶ However, the fact has been overlooked, as the footnote in the *Protocoles*, p. 35, actually admits, that our state laws refuse to grant a divorce upon the petition of both husband and wife in view of possible collusion or connivance.³⁷

The view taken by modern legislators is that marriage is not the exclusive concern of the persons married, but of the children and the state at large. Therefore the former should not be allowed to dissolve it of their own accord without the approval or decision of the court. In other words, the right of divorce is taken out of the hands of either husband or wife in order to safeguard the higher interests of society whose welfare rests upon the firm foundation of the home and the stability of marriage. And no one can deny that this view is decidedly superior to the rabbinical or Mosaic one.

But the resolution in question is unsatisfactory also from another point of view. Instead of merely recommending

an investigation of the court proceedings and its bill of divorce to the rabbi who is to remarry one of the parties, leaving it optional with him to do so at a rather late time when the investigation is difficult, it ought, in the interest of the two parties, to have the divorce bill issued by the court at once ratified from the Jewish point of view by a body of rabbis, at a time when full insight into the court proceedings can be easily obtained. In favor of such a regular rabbinical attestation of the court divorce bill to be procured immediately after the court proceedings, speaks the following consideration: Says the Midrash:³⁸ "Great is peace, for God allowed His holy name to be wiped off the scroll in the case of the woman suspected of adultery in order that peace may be restored between her and her jealous husband." Such a privilege was indeed accorded to the rabbi of old in preparing the *Get*, since he could settle many a difficulty before the divorce was agreed upon. In the same manner could the modern rabbi exert his influence in time in favor of a reconciliation, if he were expected regularly to attach his approbation from the Jewish point of view to the court divorce bill. In this sense, in my opinion, should the motion of Rabbi J. Leonard Levy, made in Atlantic City, on behalf of the Committee that 'rabbis should countersign divorce papers issued by the courts,' be adopted by the Conference and preferably in the following form: "A body of three rabbis should attest the correctness of the findings of the court in the matter of divorce from the religious point of view of Judaism and attach their signature to the bill of divorce issued by the court."³⁹

CAUSES FOR DIVORCE

As to the causes sufficient for the granting of the divorce by the court, the laws of the various States of our country differ greatly from each other and still more from the Jewish law as fixed by the Talmud. As a matter of course, the State laws must be decisive for us. But it is to be noticed that the tendency in modern times is comparatively in the direction of restricting the number of causes. According to the Table of Statutory Causes enumerated in the

Official Census Reports of 1909 (p. 268), only a few are recognized as sufficient in all the States. Adultery is sufficient in nearly all the States. Desertion in nearly all but New York and the District of Columbia; but in certain States desertion for a few months is regarded as sufficient which, of course, has led to great abuse and injury of the deserted wife. Another cause regarded as sufficient in almost all States but New York is extreme cruelty; also neglect to provide for the wife. The last two are considered sufficient also by the rabbinical law for a court decision. On the other hand, loathsome disease, which is deemed sufficient for the Jewish law, is not regarded as such in any of the States, and yet it ought to be.⁴⁰ In fact, here a law on Eugenics is certainly in place to protect the wife and her children. In the proposed Uniform Divorce Law, given on p. 272 of the Official Census Report, the causes stated are: Adultery, Extreme Cruelty, Willful Desertion for two years, besides Conviction of Crime and Habitual Drunkenness for two years. The causes sufficient in the rabbinical judgment for court proceedings mentioned above might induce us to include more, but at the same time restrict desertion to the term of five years. Until the uniform code has been accepted by the various States of the land, the rabbi must by all means withhold his approbation of the court divorce bill until he and his colleagues have ascertained that the same has not been granted on loose grounds and for flimsy causes, such as is absence for a time less than five years or wilful desertion.

B

DISSOLUTION BY DEATH

As to re-marriage in case of the disappearance and the presumption of death of one of the parties, the Jewish law widely differs from our modern State laws in so far as it would not allow the wife to re-marry unless her husband's death has been proved with certainty either by witnesses or by an unmistakable identification of the dead body. In the case of the wife's disappearance, however, no provision

is made by the Jewish law; not for the apologetic reason given by Frankel, Grundlinien (p. 40) and others as if this was but a rare case, while the husband is frequently abroad in business affairs, but for the simple reason that the original polygamous institution of oriental life saw no harm in the husband's marrying another wife. It was, then, quite logical from the modern point of view, in the interest of the unfortunate wife who had to remain in a permanent state of loneliness (*'Agunah*), to declare, as did both the Philadelphia Conference and the Augsburg Synod, that the decision whether the husband or wife is dead or lost is to be left solely to the civil court.⁴¹ But here the State laws greatly differ as to the time for re-marriage of one of the parties after the disappearance of the other. The States of Pennsylvania and Illinois require only two, Iowa and Florida three, the New England and older Southern States seven, Louisiana ten, many of the other States five years."

As the term of five years is the prevailing view, this term should be made the condition *sine qua non* of the re-marriage by the rabbi throughout the country, except, of course, where the State law requires seven years of absence.

IV

PREVENTION OF MARRIAGE

A

THE PROHIBITED MARRIAGES

The marriages prohibited in the Mosaic law as incestuous occupy, whether in toto or in part, a prominent place in all the codes of civilization and as fixed customs, to some degree, also, among the various savage tribes. The Mosaic code, however, places them distinctly above all other laws, whether ceremonial or judicial and hygienic, as preeminently important and binding upon all nations, introducing them by the following striking words: "Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them: I am the Lord your God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt,

shall ye not do; and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do; neither shall ye walk in their statutes. Mine ordinances shall ye do, and My statutes shall ye keep, to walk therein * * *. Ye shall keep My statutes and Mine ordinances which, if a man do, he shall live by them; I am the Lord." Still more significant are the closing words,⁴³ "Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things, for in all these the nations were defiled which I cast out from you, and the land was defiled; therefore did I visit the iniquity thereof upon it and the land vomited out her inhabitants. Ye therefore shall keep My statutes and Mine ordinances and shall not do any of these abominations * * * so that the land vomit not you out also, when ye defile it, as it vomited out the nations that were before you. For whosoever shall do any of these abominations, even the persons that do them shall be cut off from among their people * * *. I am the Lord, your God." It is evident that the law-giver wants these laws to be regarded as the very condition of the welfare of human society and the basic principle of domestic purity and sanctity. Accordingly, they found general acceptance among the entire Christian world and were embodied in the various codes. At the same time it was observed that, while such nations as the Egyptians and Persians permitted the marriage of near blood relations,⁴⁴ the Roman law had similar restrictions as the Hebrew, going even beyond them in the lines of consanguinity and affinity.⁴⁵ And it was upon the basis of both the Scriptural and the Roman law that the church elaborated her system of prohibited degrees, extending these by following the rule of analogy and adding to the physical or blood-relationship, the common milk and the spiritual—that is, common baptismal relationship. The church had her antecedents in a far more rational and moderate form in the rabbinical amplification of the Mosaic prohibitions, the so-called Soferic extensions שניות מדברי סופרים, extending them to the ascending and descending line, of whatever degree, and to one degree above the Mosaic and adding a new degree of a homogeneous character.

The Mosaic law, after having stated the general principle: "No one of you shall approach to any that is near of kin,"

specifies fifteen prohibitions: The mother, the step-mother, sister and half-sister, grand-daughter, and son's and daughter's daughter, father's and mother's sister, the father's brother's wife, son's wife, the brother's wife, the wife's mother or daughter; the step-son's and step-daughter's daughter, and the wife's sister during the lifetime of the former. The daughter is not expressly mentioned, but either implied in the prohibition of the grand-daughter or, as some modern exegetes think, omitted by some scribal oversight.

The Soferic extensions include in the ascending and descending line the grandmother and great-grandmother and so upward; the father's or mother's and paternal grandfather's step-mother, the wife's grandmother and so forth upward; likewise the wife's daughter and so forth upward; the grandson's wife and so forth downward, and the son's or daughter's grand-daughter. In the lateral line they add the grandfather's and grandmother's sisters and the paternal grandfather's brother's wife. All these extensions, however, have scarcely more than a theoretical value, and the only essential addition of practical import is the mother's brother's and the father's uterine brother's wife. Now it is of special historical interest to notice that not only the Karaites, but their predecessors, the Zaddokites (the question whether they are identical with the Sadducees or not, need not be discussed here) had, by the rule of analogy called *Rikkub*, extended the laws of incest to the niece and uncle, to the cousin and the deceased wife's sister and so forth.⁴⁶ By similar rules of analogy, the church law extended the Mosaic prohibitions to relations of consanguinity and affinity within the fourth degree, so that second cousins, the deceased wife's sister or niece, and the widow of any kinsman to the fourth generation and the wife's kindred to the third generation were prohibited, and, as adoption is regarded as blood-relationship in the Roman law, the marriage of an adoptive sister was also prohibited as incestuous.⁴⁷ The church canon took it for granted that the marriage between uncle and niece bears by analogy the same character as the one between aunt and nephew, and this latter being expressly prohibited, so is implicitly

also the other. Again, as the deceased brother's wife is expressly prohibited by the law as incestuous, so is the deceased wife's sister. Strange that M. M. Kalish, in his valuable commentary to Leviticus (p. 363) takes that same view as Jewish interpreter of the Mosaic laws as did the Sadducees and Karaites to whom he also refers.

Under Queen Elizabeth, in 1563, a Table of Prohibited Degrees had become 'God's law' for the Anglican church in which thirty relatives were enumerated for man and, correspondingly, for woman as forbidden to marry. Similar laws were in force in Luther's time in Germany. In 1603 the statute of Henry VIII, on the prohibited marriages, was so interpreted by both the church canon and the common law as to prohibit all marriages between relatives in the ascending and descending line ad infinitum and in the collateral line to the third degree. Upon this interpretation rested the laws also in the new country. However, with the introduction of civil marriages first in Holland and then in England and Germany, a more rational interpretation and application of the Mosaic and Ecclesiastical Marriage prohibitions came in vogue, and consequently the various state laws underwent a change. According to the greater or lesser dependence upon the old Anglo-Saxon church law, which formed the basis of the American common law, the different statutory laws concerning the prohibited degrees were, then, in the course of time, adopted and modified by the States of the Union. The difference between these is striking. Not to speak of such incestuous marriages as are abhorred by the natural instinct of man, as are those between parents and children or brothers and sisters, there are a number of marriages prohibited by many State laws which are permitted, if not even encouraged and recommended according to the Jewish law and tradition; while marriages that are prohibited by the Mosaic law are permitted by the State laws.⁴⁸ Here, then, the question arises, how far should a harmonization between the two views and practices be effected by us on general principles? Of course, the law of the State is supreme, but should marriages forbidden in one State be performed by the rabbi in another? Or should the laws of our State have sufficient

power and authority for the modern rabbi to sanction a marriage declared as incestuous by the Mosaic or Jewish Law? These are certainly serious questions, and, in order to arrive at an intelligent and unbiased solution, we must ascertain first the facts concerning the prohibitions or permissions in our various State laws of marriages, regarded adversely by the Jewish law, and then investigate, as far as we can, the reasons which in all probability guided the sacred law-giver on the one hand and the modern legislators on the other.

The following are the interesting facts presented by the official government report in its Digest of Marriage Laws of the Different States, p. 200-263:

According to it, the marriage between uncle and niece is like one between aunt (that is maternal as well as paternal and including also the uncle's widow) and nephew, and is everywhere (contrary to the Mosaic law) prohibited as incestuous; and so, in 19 against 22 States and Territories, is the marriage of cousins. The tendency to extend the prohibition of the latter over the whole country is shown in the legislature acts, for instance, of Louisiana in 1900; of Illinois, 1887; Mississippi, 1889; Michigan, 1903. On the other hand, the marriage of the deceased brother's wife is, contrary to the Jewish law, as little prohibited as is the deceased wife's sister. Here, then, the question arises, how far should the view and practice of our country influence out attitude as rabbis? Of course, it is self-evident that marriages prohibited by the law of the State are prohibited to us also from the Jewish point of view, unless the Jews are specifically excepted, as is the case in Rhode Island. Consequently, no rabbi should go out of his State where consanguineous marriages are prohibited to officiate in another State at the marriage of a cousin in order to evade the law of his own State. But the question is, whether consanguineous marriages should not, from the modern, or from the American point of view, be declared by this Conference as altogether forbidden and to be avoided and voidable.

Before taking up, however, this question of prohibiting, on behalf of modern Judaism, the marriage of cousin and of niece, though in contradiction to traditional Jewish

practices and views, the other question comes up for consideration which has already been touched upon several times in our discussions at various Conferences, particularly in connection with my reports on Responsa a year and two years ago. And that is, whether we, as reform rabbis, have the power of abrogating such prohibitory laws of marriages as are classified among the laws on incest in Mosaic and Rabbinical Judaism, but are no longer held to be such in the modern, especially in the American, view. To this class belongs the marriage of the deceased brother's widow, whether she has been left with children or not. As I remarked two years ago in my report on Responsa, this matter is too serious to be decided by one single rabbi, however eminent in learning or position, as it involves the question of the legitimacy of the children, the question of bastardy—*פסול ממורות*—from the viewpoint of the Jewish law. In order to arrive at a clear and basic standpoint from which the principle of reform might be applied to the Mosaic-Talmudical marriage laws, it seems necessary to examine the various explanations and characterizations of these laws given at various times by Biblical exegetes, philosophers and students of history and ethnology.

There is a remarkable passage in the Sifra on this very subject of prohibited marriages which cannot but clarify our view. After having declared at the start that the non-Jew as well as the Jew is bound to observe the laws concerning incestuous marriages⁴⁹ and their great importance as typical for the acceptance of the belief in the Only One and holy God has been dwelt on at length, we are told that, like the fundamental laws on justice, on the sacredness of life and of the name of God, so are the laws on incest dictated by human reason and the consensus of man, and different altogether from the dietary and the ritual laws which the heathen world and the evil spirit of insubmissiveness find fault with.⁵⁰ Our ancient sages, then, did not view these laws on incest as ordinances that are to be blindly accepted without inquiry into their reasons, but they should be treated like all moral laws of a universal character and intrinsic truth. We have accordingly the right and the imperative duty to investigate the reasons

and origins of these laws, and should we find that conditions and views have modified these laws in the consciousness of men, we may as reform rabbis claim the right of abrogating those that are no longer in harmony with our modern views.

Before mentioning Philo as the first Jewish writer who endeavors to comment on these Mosaic laws on incest from a philosophical and universal viewpoint, Plato must be quoted for having said that 'an unwritten law which is a most perfect safeguard keeps brother and sister as well as son and daughter from open or secret sexual intercourse.'⁵¹ Philo is the first to offer as reasons for these prohibited marriages both the so-called horror naturalis, the innate abhorrence of an intercourse with blood-relations and the *respectus parentelae*, that is, the natural regard for persons identified with the parents through matrimonial union. The latter works as affinity both upward and downward as well as sideward, and keeps men from sexual intercourse with the daughter-in-law or mother-in-law, step-daughter and step-mother, step-sister, sister-in-law, and brother's wife, and, correspondingly, keeps women from such affinities. The marriage relation should be based on an affection totally different from blood relationship, and the Mosaic prohibitions are intended as safeguards against moral depravity.⁵² This latter rationalistic view is also expressed by Saadia⁵³ and Maimonides. The latter suggests another more physiological reason, besides. "It is against nature," he says, "that root and branch, that is parent and child, should have intercourse, neither should they co-mingle in a third person such as the wife's mother or daughter, or the father's or son's wife and the wife's sister." In some instances the relatives are considered one person, such as the mother's or father's sister; in other instances, not, such as the daughter of the parents' brother or sister; wherefore a man may marry his niece, but not his aunt, because, being more frequently in his uncle's house, his wife is to him like his own brother's wife; whereas, he is less frequently in the nephew's house and he is therefore less familiar with his nephew's wife.⁵⁴

Complicated as this and similar explanations of the

prohibited degrees are, we find Jehudah Halevi⁵⁵ taking them as social or universal laws as to the general principle but as particularistic statutes in regard to the specific prohibitions. All these explanations, however, bear the character of theories and hypotheses, not of established facts; and fail to take cognizance of the conditions and environments of the Biblical and rabbinical legislators. The fact must not be overlooked that the oriental view of the predominant power of man and of the submissiveness of woman may have influenced these prohibitive laws which discriminate between the marriage of uncle and niece and that of aunt and nephew in favor of the former and against the latter. Our modern ethnological studies, the best and most recognized authority of which is Westermarck, have thrown new light on the whole subject, and we can no longer isolate the Mosaic laws on marriage from the laws and customs of other nations and tribes, whether civilized or not, whether Semitic or Aryan. It is generally acknowledged today that the desire to go out of one's own tribe to carry off or to purchase a wife, the so-called exogamic practice, gave rise to a far more extensive line of prohibited degrees than was adhered to upon the higher stage of civilization, when a certain homogeneity coupled with heterogeneity was aimed at, and certain physiological and social experiences led to the adoption of guiding principles in the determination of marriages to be shunned and abhorred. Hence the similarity in general of Hindoo and Roman, of Arabic, later on, Mohammedan, and Mosaic prohibitions, whereas there is a difference maintained in detail, as in the case of consanguineous marriages or the marriage between uncle and niece which were forbidden to the ancient Romans.⁵⁶ Thus our ethnological science offers substantial support to the religious concept of the Levitical laws on incest in general, while, at the same time, it places them in the category of universal, social, or moral laws, leaving it to our own judgment how far they must be binding for us. And there comes our physiological knowledge to our aid to determine the intrinsic value of the Mosaic-Talmudic prohibitions. Now the theory advanced, for instance, by Ludwig Philippson in his Bible Commentary, we find

occasionally accepted by primitive tribes, namely, that the male is the procreative element while the female is only the receptive one; therefore the relative of the father is regarded as closer blood relative to make the marriage incestuous than that of the mother. Still it does not stand the test of modern physiology which, on the contrary, ascribes the main function of the life of the species to the female. Moreover, careful observation of the results of procreation in animal as well as human offspring has established the fact that too close relationship is in many cases detrimental to the soundness and vigor of the offspring, whereas the new and foreign element works as a healthy stimulus for the species. We may, accordingly, come to the conclusion that just as the Mosaic laws have been amplified by the Soferim by the addition of the mother's brother's wife to the list of prohibitions in the correct recognition that the maternal uncle is as close a blood relation as is the paternal uncle, so should we, and, in fact, with greater justification, amplify from our modern point of view, the Mosaic-Talmudic prohibitions and include the niece as well as the cousin, both being blood relations, the matrimonial union of whom should be avoided on physiological and, in America, on social, if not legal, grounds.

On the other hand, we cannot shut our eyes to the general observation that, in public opinion, the deceased brother's wife stands to the brother-in-law in the same relation as does the deceased wife's sister. The layman not versed in the Jewish law and practice fails to see why the marriage of one is perfectly legitimate and under circumstances even advisable, as, for instance, where there are children left by the wife which would probably be looked after by the sister as the second wife, and why the marriage of the other should be regarded as incest, especially so when there are children left by the brother.

As I stated before, the question was a matter of bitter controversy between Dr. Einhorn and Dr. Cohn, of San Francisco, when finally Dr. Wise married a couple, taking the stand that according to the Mosaic law the marriage would have been not merely legitimate, but imperative. A

private letter which I then had from Dr. Geiger showed me that Dr. Geiger sided with Wise against Einhorn.⁵⁷ The stand taken by David Einhorn, Samuel Hirsch and B. Felsenthal was that since the Levirate marriage is no longer in force with us, the prohibition of the brother-in-law's widow remains just as if the same had children, in which case the marriage is incestuous. Dr. Cohn and Dr. Wise, however, asserted that the law of Levirate shows that there is no incest in the case of the widow's childlessness, and so they were permitted to solemnize the marriage. However, it can hardly be said that there is great consistency in this view. Either the Levirate law is in force, otherwise the marriage is incestuous from the Mosaic-Talmudic point of view, or the entire law prohibiting the marriage of the deceased brother's wife as incestuous has, together with the Levirate law, lost all meaning and binding force for us, and the brother-in-law may marry his brother's widow as he may marry his deceased wife's sister.⁵⁸

To be more explicit, the question from the Mosaic-Talmudical point of view is not whether the marriage of the deceased brother's wife is permissible or not, but whether in case the brother died without leaving a child—the Mosaic law has only 'a son'—the marriage is an imperative duty on the part of the surviving brother, from which he can be released only by the *Halizah* act, or whether the same is forbidden as incestuous. The critical-historical view which assigns the Deuteronomic law concerning the Levirate⁵⁹ to the time of King Josiah, while it assigns the law in Leviticus which prohibits the marriage of the deceased brother's wife twice unconditionally⁶⁰ as incestuous to the so-called priestly code of post-exilic time, cannot be considered here. For, even though it be admitted that the priestly code intended to do away with the ancient institution of the Levirate, the actual Jewish law retained it and, besides, Judaism is based upon the Mosaic law as an undivided whole. The discrepancy between the law in Leviticus and the Deuteronomic law is, upon the traditional basis, therefore, so explained that the latter simply states an exception in the case of the widow's childlessness from the general prohibition.

Nevertheless, it is important to notice that the Samar-

itans, who, as a rule, represent the older practice, following the Sadducees, applied the Levirate law only to the case where the brother died when the woman in question was only betrothed to him and not his real wife, declaring that otherwise the surviving brother would commit incest in marrying her.⁶¹

The Karaites, who are more or less closely connected with the old Samaritans, went so far as to declare the whole Levirate law to be no longer in force, in view of the changed conditions in the exile, and some of them would apply the law only to the betrothed ones, while taking the term 'brothers' with reference to the story of Boaz and Ruth, in the wider sense of relatives. But also in the rabbinical tradition, the ancient institution of the Levirate underwent an essential change owing to the altered social conditions. Not only were the words "son" in verse 5 and 'first born' in verse 6 differently explained, but the original obligation to marry the brother's widow was, as can be learned from the Mishna and the Talmud of Yebamot, more and more limited by all kinds of obstacles the rabbis could possibly discover. Nay, the Ḥalizah act itself was given a new meaning, that of a release of the widow rather than that of the surviving brother; while the incestuous character of the marriage with the deceased brother's wife was more and more accentuated. Most remarkable in this respect is the opinion expressed by Abba Saul:⁶² "He who marries his deceased brother's wife on account of her beauty or of her possessions commits an act of fornication and the issue of such a marriage comes near to bastardy." And this very opinion has been adopted in the Mishna:⁶³ "In the former days the Levirate marriage was considered as preferable to the Ḥalizah, because the marriage was entered into with the sole purpose of fulfilling the law, but nowadays, when this pure motive no longer prevails, the Ḥalizah is preferable." At a later time the Levirate marriage was again declared to be preferable,⁶⁴ and this view was adopted in the Codes. Only in consequence of Rabbenu Gershom's interdict of polygamy for the occidental Jewry was the Levirate marriage finally abandoned and the Ḥalizah took its place.⁶⁵

This, however, is certain, that unless we restore the Mosaic law enjoining the Levirate marriage as an imperative duty and insist on the *Halizah* act in case of a refusal, the marriage of the deceased brother's wife remains under all conditions forbidden according to the Mosaic-Talmudical law. There is then but one alternative: Either we accept this law under all conditions, whether the widow has a child by her former husband or not, or we consult our own religious and moral consciousness in the matter, which finds no distinction between the relation of the deceased brother's wife to the brother and that of the deceased wife's sister to the brother-in-law, since the idea that man and wife are to be 'as one person' applies equally to both.

It seems to me that we should, after due consideration of all the questions involved, amplify the list of prohibited marriages as the *Soferim* did and include the marriage of the niece and that of cousins as blood-relations;⁶⁶ and, on the other hand, declare that from our modern viewpoint the marriage of the deceased brother's wife is no more incestuous than is the marriage of the deceased wife's sister.

In making these important recommendations, which aim at an essential reform of the Mosaic-Rabbinical laws on prohibited marriages, I wish to make my point of view as clear as possible. I always held and still hold the marriage laws of the Mosaic code, with their sharp denunciation of the abominable character of these incestuous marriages, as being of the utmost importance, they having contributed much to the stability and purity of the domestic life not only of the Jew, but of civilized mankind. Nor would I have any rabbi of modern views treat any of these prohibitions with levity, and disregard the sacred traditions and practices of the past, assuming the right of deciding questions of such vital significance single-handedly without consultation with experienced and learned colleagues. However, the matter for consideration, as I understand it, is whether the Mosaic laws which, as a comparison of the facts of Israelitish history and the Deuteronomic law (XXVII, 20-24) with Leviticus XVIII and XX shows, have gone through a process of growth and development like

any other Mosaic law, are to remain for us ever the same, only to be amplified by the Soferic extensions, or whether we modern rabbis have also the right and the duty to alter or modify them according to the best of our understanding and in accordance with our moral and religious consciousness. Now it seems to me that the list of prohibited relations, the characterization of which might best be expressed in the German term *Blutshande*, the Hebrew *Toebah* (abomination), ought from the standpoint of modern investigations, physiological and ethnological, be enlarged. While the advisability and healthiness of consanguineous marriages are in themselves still a debatable question, certainly it is amply corroborated that in case there is the slightest trace of defect or ill-health in the family of one of the parties, the evil consequences of the marriage are aggravated in their descendants to engender physical and mental disabilities. And the same is, in a still larger degree, the case with the marriage between uncle and niece. It is always the co-mingling of root and branch which is obnoxious and injurious. Quite different is the case of such affinities as exist in the marriage of the sister-in-law on the wife's side or the brother's side. Here the general trend of opinion is favorable to the marriage, and we need not feel bound by the letter of the law, but should rather penetrate into the spirit of the same.

It should be superfluous to state that according to both the Jewish and the State laws, the half-sister and the mother's or father's half-sister belong to the prohibited degrees, whether the statute of the State law expressly states it or not. The same holds good also in regard to the step-mother or step-daughter which, in some American States, are not among the prohibited degrees.

PERSONAL PREVENTION OF MARRIAGES AND EUGENICS

According to the rabbinical law, the wife can force her husband to divorce her in case he is notoriously dissolute; or physically incapacitated to beget children;⁶⁷ or in case he is an inveterate transgressor. Upon the same principle the duty devolves upon the rabbi who is to perform a mar-

riage ceremony to ascertain beforehand whether the conditions for a healthy state of marriage exist or not. Certainly he ought, by no means, lend his hand to a marriage concerning which well-founded doubts as to the moral soundness of the candidate for marriage exist. As to the requirement of a medical certificate of cleanness, there is still a wide difference of opinion among experts as to the wisdom or feasibility of the method, in view of the fact that the determination of the young people to marry may find many ways to evade the law. That Judaism has at all times inculcated principles of personal purity and never countenanced a double standard of conduct for husband and wife either during or before the marital state needs no specific declaration on the part of a body of rabbis.

DEAF AND DUMB

Dr. Mielziner devotes a special paragraph (par. 34, p. 70) in his book to the incompetency of persons that are deaf and dumb to contract a valid marriage, referring to Yebamot XIII; Gemarah 112b; to Maimonides H. Ishut IV, 9; and Eben Ha Ezer XLIV, 1. Only in the footnote he states that according to the modern State laws such persons are competent to contract a valid marriage, and subsequently he refers in the same note to some learned rabbis 'in whose opinion this Talmudic view should no longer be maintained for the reason that the deaf and dumb of our days have been sufficiently educated to be able to communicate their ideas in writing as well as in audible words.' The rabbis quoted from Leopold Loew's Ben Hanania, Vol I and II, are Hochmuth, Dushak, Back and Leopold Loew.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Mielziner ought to have distinctly stated that the Talmudic view which places the deaf and dumb among the class of idiots and, therefore, declares them as incompetent either to enter into any contract or to serve as witnesses to any legal act is no longer tenable in our time when the rationality and intelligence of these persons has been proven in a most remarkable way. As the matter has, to my knowledge, never been brought before any rabbinical body, our Conference ought to pass resolu-

tions to the effect, that the Talmudic laws concerning the incompetency of deaf and dumb persons either to contract a marriage or to serve as witnesses to any document are based upon an erroneous view and are of no validity for us.⁶⁸

TEMPORARY PREVENTIONS OF MARRIAGE

Dr. Mielziner's book devotes three paragraphs of Ch. VIII (p. 61-63) to Temporary Impediments to Marriage. In the first one, he states the rabbinic law which prohibits the widow within the ninety days after her husband's death and likewise a divorced woman within the same period from the day on which she has received the divorce document to enter another state of wedlock. The reason for this prohibition is to prevent any uncertainty as to the paternity of the first child born in the second marriage. And this provision of a ninety days' interval has been extended by the Talmudists also to cases, where there could have been no presumption of the wife's pregnancy at the first husband's death or at her divorce. See Yebamot IV, 10, 41b; Maim. Gerushin IX, 18. Eban Ha Ezer XIII, 1.

This wise law, based chiefly upon what is called *turbatio sanguinis* in the Roman law, where the lapse of ten months is required, has been accepted in modern legislation, such as the French law, where the ten months' interval is required, and the Prussian law where a whole year's interval is required for the widow; but, strange to say, has not been adopted in any of our American State laws. I do not find it mentioned in the official census report, either. As Dr. Mielziner correctly says, while referring to Bouvier, Institutes I, 291, and Law Dictionary, article 'Widowhood,' the law ought to have a place in our statute books as being a law of decency. Certainly the rabbi is bound to uphold this ancient Jewish law and extend the ninety days' interval to ten months, unless urgent reasons make it advisable to restrict the time to ninety days. A resolution of this character ought to be passed by our Conference and at the same time the desirability should be expressed of having this law embodied in the Uniform Code of Marriage and Divorce.

REGARDING ELOPEMENTS

Dr. Simon calls my special attention to the fact that a number of States would not consider a marriage valid without the consent of the parents. In view of this and in order to give expression to what has become a leading maxim of the Jewish rabbis, especially in reform congregations of America, I would lay down the principle that no rabbi should perform the marriage ceremony without being assured that the matrimonial union he is to solemnize in the name and with the religious sanction of Judaism will not constitute a real break in the chain of family life. Should the consent of the parents or the nearest relations of the one or the other party be persistently withheld, he should lend his hand to the marriage only after he is satisfied that the parental refusal to give their consent to the same is not based upon moral or other weighty grounds, and that, as the representative of Judaism with its sacred traditions of a pure and sacred home life, he feels justified in solemnizing the marriage. Particularly should he, in case the bride and bridegroom are personally unknown to him, insist on having as witnesses persons known to him for their reliability and integrity of character. By no means should he, as is done by many non-Jewish ministers, perform the ceremony of marriage when the couple comes to him without previous information and due instruction.

CIVIL MARRIAGES IN THEIR RELATIONS TO JUDAISM

Ever since the declaration of the Napoleonic Sanhedrin, the civil marriage is recognized by the authorities of Judaism as perfectly and absolutely valid, even when it lacks the consecration of the Jewish religion by its special rite of solemnization. Accordingly, in my report as Chairman of the Committee on Responsa last year (see Yearbook, XXIV, p. 154), I took the stand that a non-Jewess, married legally to a member of the Jewish community, may be buried in a Jewish cemetery upon the lot owned by her husband and vice versa, provided, that both the funeral and the tombstone bear the character demanded by the

Jewish faith. A resolution to this effect should be passed by the Conference.

There is, however, another point of a more serious character to be considered in connection with civil marriages. This is in regard to the offspring of marriages regarded as legal by the state, but not permitted from the point of view of the Jewish religion. According to the Jewish law, the marriage between Jews and non-Jews which necessarily lacks the religious sanction is, just as the Catholic religion declares it, like concubinage, and the children follow the status of the mother.⁶⁹ However, with all our insistence on the religious sanction of the marriage relations and the necessity of a pure undivided Jewish home life, we cannot afford to ignore the legitimacy of the children. And, as the majority of rabbis against R. Akiba in Yebamot (44b) declare the forbidden marriage is *Toebah* (abomination), but *not* the innocent children, so we, too, must insist upon the unimpaired purity and legitimacy of the children. And the same standpoint we should also take in those more serious cases of prohibited marriages in which the civil law refuses to rob the children of their claim to recognition as the offspring of a legitimate marriage. However strict or rigid we may be in prohibiting such marriages as are declared incestuous by the Jewish law, we shall and must hold our protecting arms over the innocent children, and endeavor to win them for a pure Jewish life, no matter what taint the parental marriage has cast upon their origin. The great mission of the prophet Elijah before the arrival of the Messianic Era, says the Talmud, is to purify the house of Israel and bring those that are far off nigh and to declare those that are under the cloud of impurity to be pure, and so bring the hearts of children nigh to the parents and the hearts of parents to their children. (Eduyot XIII, 7.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to make this paper of practical value, I herewith offer the following recommendations:

1. The Central Conference of American Rabbis should declare that the Jewish woman be regarded religiously as

the equal of man, and, therefore, if she so desires, be considered a full member of the congregation with every right and privilege connected therewith; that she may serve as witness to any legal act, and that her signature under the marriage certificate be considered as valid in the eyes of Judaism today as is that of man; furthermore, that the bride at the marriage ceremony hand a ring to the bridegroom while reciting the marriage formula after the bridegroom has given her a ring with the accompanying marriage formula.

2. The Marriage Formula should bear the distinctly Jewish character as hallowed by tradition and recited by both bride and bridegroom while they give the ring to each other in the words: "Be consecrated unto me as wife (husband) according to the law of God and the faith of Israel." That in place of any symbolism in connection with the ring, as is the custom of the church, the rabbi should utilize the cup of wine handed to the bridal couple as symbolic of the cup of destiny from which they henceforth draw life's joys and sorrows in common. Furthermore in continuity with Jewish tradition, the opening or closing words should contain some allusion to the story of Adam and Eve expressive of the idea that 'Man and woman shall be *one flesh*.'

3. Inasmuch as the civil courts in many States often grant a divorce in cases where, from the religious view of Judaism, objections might be raised, a body of three rabbis should attest to the correctness, from the Jewish point of view, of the findings of the court in matters of divorce, and attach their signatures to the bill of divorce issued by the court.

4. The Central Conference of American Rabbis should declare that among the causes sufficient for granting a divorce besides adultery and extreme cruelty, there ought also to be enumerated loathsome diseases, as the Jewish law has it.

In regard to wilful desertion, five years instead of two should be made the rule; and no rabbi should officiate at the re-marriage before the lapse of five years of absence of

either husband or wife, and even after the court has dissolved the marriage.

Also in cases of the disappearance of either husband or wife, only after the lapse of five years should a re-marriage by the rabbi be allowed.

5. The list of prohibited marriages should be augmented in the direction of blood-relationship, and include the marriage of cousins and of the niece, in consonance with the laws of a large number of our States and the general trend of public opinion in these days, which regards consanguineous marriages in many respects as obnoxious and injurious.

On the other hand, the list of Mosaic prohibitions of marriage declared as incestuous should no longer include the case of the deceased brother's wife, in view of the fact that the Deuteronomic law of Levirate contradicts the conception of incest as is given it in Leviticus. This question should be made the subject of further consideration and consultation with the view of modifying or abrogating the law.

6. Persons that are deaf and dumb are in our view perfectly equal to others in rationality; and the ancient law concerning their incompetency as to contracting marriage or as witnesses no longer has any value and binding force for us.

7. The Jewish law prohibiting a widow or a divorced wife from remarrying before the lapse of ninety days after the death of or after the divorce from her husband, should by all means be upheld by the modern rabbi; but instead of ninety days, the law prevailing in European countries which requires ten months or a full year ought to be placed on our statute book and observed by the modern rabbi.

8. In view of the fact that the civil marriage is fully recognized by us also from the Jewish standpoint as valid and binding, we ought to recommend that a non-Jewess married legally to a member of the Jewish community may be buried in a Jewish cemetery upon the lot owned by her husband, and vice versa, provided that both the funeral and the tombstone bear the character demanded by the Jewish faith and have no symbol or rite of another creed.

9. The offspring of marriages that are regarded as legal by the law of the state, but could for one reason or the other not receive the religious sanction of Judaism, should in no wise be regarded as illegitimate, but should be brought up as Jews, and come under the hallowing influence of the Jewish religion according to the principle of Hillel: "Love your fellowmen and bring them nigh to the Torah."

ISRAEL'S SOLIDARITY, AMERICAN REFORM JUDAISM, AND THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

I GLADLY avail myself of the kind invitation of Dr. Morgenstern to preach my Farewell Sermon today before the season closes with the Ordination. It offers me the welcome opportunity of voicing with my feeble tongue the sentiments which crowd upon me at the thought of leaving, after almost nineteen years' work, this beloved and sacred spot at which I passed some of the proudest and happiest days of my life, and bidding good-bye to you, my dear friends and esteemed co-workers on the Board of Governors and in the Faculty; to you, my beloved boys, the object of my warmest interest and solicitude, as well as that of my devoted wife and daughters, and to all of you, my cherished Cincinnati friends whom I and mine shall surely miss. Having been called to this exalted post as a sexagenarian, at an age when many lay down their life work as finished, I was, by the bountiful grace of Divine Providence, privileged to continue with my humble powers the grand work of Dr. Wise, the immortal founder and for twenty-five years President of the College, and his immediate successors as Acting President of the College, Moses Meilziner and Gotthard Deutsch, whose recent death created a great void throughout learned Jewry. Aided and encouraged by the hearty support and co-operation of the Board of Governors, I was enabled to make it rise from its humble site in the valley to these glorious city heights, and to make it grow in all directions and dimensions, in the number of its students and of the members of the faculty, and, owing to the efficiency of the Librarian, Mr. Oko, also in the enlargement and expansion of our Library. As Rabbi Tarfon once said to Rabbi Akiba, his colleague: "To part with thee is like parting with the best of my life," so do pangs of inexpressible sorrow fill my heart and that of my family in parting from this place in which we have taken deep root. Hallowed by the memory of Isaac M. Wise, of the unforget-

ten Bernhard Bettman, and the unforgettable, whole-souled Edward L. Heinsheimer, and the high-minded and genial President of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, J. Walter Freiberg, and endeared to me and mine by the ever-ready assistance and personal attachment of the honored President, Alfred M. Cohen, and his associates on the Board, this Sanctuary of the Torah had become to me a fountain of inspiration which endowed me with new vigor and youthful enthusiasm to enable me to accomplish what I did for the welfare and progress of the College and its students. And I trust that my removal to New York will not affect my relations to you nor yours to me, but that something of the spirit which united and consecrated us for our work will abide with us. But let me not further indulge in emotions which draw tears from our eyes. Our Rabbis offer us wholesome advice in saying: "When bidding farewell to a friend, make the parting moments an occasion for the outpouring of a powerful lesson for life." Sentiment melts away, ardent emotions cool down, but the truth taught remains engraved upon the memory, ever to be recalled with joy. So I take from our Torah portions this afternoon a text which has served as a talisman and token of abiding love for millions of Jewish hearts and homes at solemn hours of parting or of life's consecration, a treasury of comfort and peace which priest, patriarch and minister ever offered to congregations and individuals—the *birkat cohanim*—the PRIESTLY BLESSING.

A three-fold benediction echoed forth, like a celestial symphony with its wonderful rhythm, in each Jewish household of old, as in our Synagogue today, Sabbath and holy days, it points in its three brief sentences upward to God as the Fountain of all blessing, of all light and all peace. It opens up, as I shall try to show, the three great sources of blessing for us, first the SOLIDARITY OF ISRAEL, whose ancestor, Abraham, was sent forth on his wanderings with the message: "Be a blessing to all families on earth"; second, AMERICAN REFORM JUDAISM, whose pioneers enriched and rejuvenated Israel in these modern days by the light of faith they kindled in all hearts anew; and third, the HEBREW UNION COLLEGE, which unfolded and

nurtured the spirit of the Jewish faith in dormant souls, to win thousands and tens of thousands anew for Israel's Only One on the virgin soil of America (and may I bespeak your kind and patient attention to these subjects).

My first theme then is Israel, the champion of the Lord, the people sent forth twice from their Judean home to settle in all parts of the globe in order to be 'the witnesses of God, the light of the nations and the interlinking covenant of the peoples.' Has there ever been a nation in history with a similar destiny and life task? Surely the Jew has been and still is the puzzle of mankind, the enigma of history. Having been the target of hatred and persecution, of malice and scorn for these two thousand years and more, he underwent his unparalleled martyrdom with undaunted heroism and unabated faith in his providential mission of truth and justice, so as to wrest admiration and awe even from his relentless foe. The servant of the Lord, the crucified Messiah of the nations, he was indeed like the lamb that goes to the slaughter without opening his mouth, except for the cry: *Shema Yisrael!* But the secret of his strength lay in the solidarity of all Israel. All for one and one for all, yet God in us all—this was his watchword and pledge of victory throughout the past ages. When a non-Jew once voiced his astonishment at the unheard-of fact that seventy wolves were pursuing one meek lamb, while the lamb remained alive, the Jew would point heavenward, saying: "Behold the Shepherd who holds them all at bay in protecting the threatened lamb!" Today, alas!—the lamb runs away from the Shepherd. The very ones that just escaped the tyrant's scourge, the pogroms and cruelties of the Czar's henchmen, no longer know Him who had shielded and preserved Israel so miraculously during the dark ages, but are eager to sell their birthright for the mess of pottage of a citizenship in Palestine. I wonder whether they or their spokesmen and leaders ever pondered over the well-known parable with which the martyr-prince, Akiba, silenced the well-meant warning of his friend, Pappus, not to imperil his life by teaching the Law before large gatherings in defiance of the cruel Hadrianic edict? A fox, he said, standing on the shore, addressed the fishes in

the water, saying: "See ye not the nets spread all around you to catch you? Come up to the land to escape the peril!" Whereupon the fishes replied: "The water is our vital element. If this fails to offer us safety, on land we will surely perish." So with us, if the atmosphere of the Torah, if the Jewish truth which is our very life, no longer protects us, we will certainly be lost.

With God, the Jew is invincible, without God, he is a Samson shorn of his strength. Abraham is called Haibri—the Hebrew, which means one from the other side, says the Midrash, because God said to him: "Let all the world with their delusions and falsehoods be on the one side, if you will but side with Me, you will win." In loyalty to his world-task the Jew, despite all tribulations, will prove to be the unconquerable conqueror, not of a tiny territory, but of the wide world. Not a political nation like any other, but a nation wedded to the Torah, as its life purpose, said the Gaon Saadia a thousand years ago, in protest against the race Jews.

The issue today is no longer between Orthodoxy and Reform, but between a world with God and a world without God. It is irreligion in both the anti-Semite and in the Jewish nationalist that imperils Jew and Judaism today. Our solidarity must not be felt and manifested merely in our social relations to each other. However wondrous and exemplary be the bountiful outpouring of charity by American Israel, the Joseph among the brethren, for the starving multitudes of the East, more imperative and replete with seeds of greater blessing for the future is the maintenance of the spiritual bond of solidarity to be kept for all time in our sacred heritage. So may the God of Israel ever bless thee, and be thy keeper for all the ages.

My second point for consideration is AMERICAN REFORM JUDAISM, which is too often misunderstood and misjudged. It was neither levity and irreverence, nor catering to social and political recognition, but earnest seeking after truth and inner harmony, the light of God's countenance, which created the Reform movement in Germany. Nor did frivolous desire for assimilation of the Jew to the surrounding world give impetus and motive

power to successful American Reform Judaism. It is a mistake to spell it Reformed Judaism, as if it were something fixed and final, as in the Reformation of Luther and Calvin. What we claim is that Judaism has been and is a continuous evolutionary process of growth and reform. As when creating the visible world, says the Midrash, so did God's fiat: "Let there be light," summon forth the forces of the spiritual world when at the dawn of history Abraham appeared as the first great reformer, who broke down the idols of his father and went forth preaching the pure faith in God. So were all the great prophets of Israel reformers deprecating meaningless rites and insisting on righteousness instead. The Pharisees, too, who replaced the literal observance of the Law by more spiritual concepts of the same, were in some respects reformers. But it was in modern days that the prophetic call: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, for the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee!" has been heard in Israel anew when the darkness of the Ghetto covered the eyes of the people to make them cling to fossilized Shulhan Aruch orthodoxy, which threatened to crush the spirit of Judaism, while on the other hand the light of modern culture dazzled the eyes of many to turn them altogether astray. Reform came not as a destructive but as a saving power to Judaism. First Abraham Geiger, the pathfinder of Reform, showed by his penetrating historical inquiry into the monuments of the past, which the master-mind of Leopold Zunz had elucidated and systematized, that Judaism was not immovable Law, such as Sargent in these days presented it in his portrayal of Moses on the wall of the Boston Library, but a constant process of growth and development throughout its various stages and phases, and that the Synagogue today is vigorous and youthful enough to so influence church and mosque as to lead them onward to the prophetic goal of true, world-conquering Monotheism, to the one and only God and one humanity. Then came David Einhorn in the company of mental heroes like Holdheim and Samuel Hirsch, offering a theological system having Israel's Messianic hope as its crowning cupola, and reared upon firm principles which he embodied in the Prayer-book he wrote, after which the

Union Prayer-book was modeled. And with the illuminating stroke of genius Isaac M. Wise stepped forth in America's land of freedom, and with the words: "Let there be light," as his motto, educated the people by gradual reforms, finally to win the West, the South, and parts of the East for a regenerated Judaism. Thus by prophetic foresight and indomitable perseverance and energy he became the God-chosen instrument of progress and reform as the Americanizer of Jew and Judaism in synagogue and school. Thus American Reform Judaism, while a product of German Reform, bears the imprint of Isaac M. Wise.

Each of the three words, American Reform Judaism, has a significance of its own. Judaism tells of our allegiance to our common inheritance in all its essentials. Reform enunciates the principle of progress which takes cognizance of the needs of time and environment. Finally, the word American accentuates not merely our undivided loyalty to our land and its free institutions, which all our fellow-citizens, Jew or non-Jew, manifest alike, but also the obligation to enrich and advance the moral and spiritual life of our American commonwealth by all the forces, the inherited treasures and the lofty ideals of Judaism for the realization of the highest aims of humanity in the spirit of the great founders of our Republic. In this sense does the second verse of my text hold forth the monition: Let the light of God's countenance shine forth to illumine life's pathway by ever renewed revelations in nature and history, and by an ever deeper insight into the forces and needs of man and humanity, yet at the same time let the divine grace of virtue, of kindness and love crown all efforts. In the one word the Rabbis find the appeal for a priesthood that kindles the light and fans the fire at the shrine of faith, and in the other an appeal for prophetic leadership whose burning zeal for truth and righteousness carries men to ever higher and serene realms of perfection and holiness. Piety must be allied to progress, loyalty to liberalism, to lead us to our high goal.

Coming now to the third and culminating point of my text, I find the high aim and object of the Hebrew Union College exquisitely expressed in the words: "May the Lord

turn His countenance to you," which is understood to mean: "May the Shekinah, God's majesty, dwell upon and within you!" All material blessings, all intellectual and social attainments, must find their crowning success, their hallowing force in that satisfaction which comes from within in the divine life which makes us one with God and man. This we call spirituality. Such a power-house of the Spirit the training school for Rabbis must be. Light and learning may be obtained through books. Religious truth demands an atmosphere permeated by a spirit which lifts man above himself to make him a messenger of the Lord of hosts. The Talmud records a dispute between the house of Shammai and the house of Hillel, as to who should be admitted into the high-school of Rabbinic lore. The former in their rigor would admit only such as give assurance in advance of their superior worthiness; the latter, more broad-minded than these, would open their halls wide to admit all, saying as it were with Moses: "Would that the whole people of God be prophets because God lays His spirit upon them." With such broadness of mind, upon the democratic basis of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Hebrew Union College was founded, yet with the high aim and uppermost purpose of kindling the fire of Sinai in every devotee of the Torah, so as to make him possess and impart not merely knowledge, but fervent faith and religious devotion to young and old.

Thus two hundred and twenty graduates went forth from here to turn progressive and enlightened Jewry throughout the length and breadth of the land into warm-hearted and zealous Jews, into a people of God, nay, more, to make Judaism a power and influence everywhere, so as to win a listening world for the truth of Israel's one and only God. It is no exaggeration to say that the Hebrew Union College transformed America into a land of promise for world-conquering Judaism with its bright outlook for a united humanity in the future. As the school-house founded by Rab in Sura made Babylonia the Holy Land of the Torah for centuries, so does the grand plantation of Isaac M. Wise bid fair to make America the Holy Land of progressive, yet positive Judaism, for future generations.

In order to fully appreciate the work it has accomplished, you have but to glance at Europe's institutions of learning today! There you see but confusion and chaos among congregations and Rabbis, no unity and harmony among the religious leaders. No vision nor spirituality, but dry as dust learning here and multifarious 'Wissenschaft' there, but no theological system nor positive principles to guide the future Rabbi. The Hebrew Union College unified and centralized the forces of progressive Jewry and thus has become a powerful factor of religious life, whether intellectually and socially or spiritually, throughout the land and beyond.

All the more deplorable is the attempt made in certain quarters today to split the power, the unity and the authority of the Hebrew Union College by the proposed creation of a Jewish Institute of Religion, which would be just colorless and nondescript enough to suit certain classes of men in a Free Synagogue, or of a Hochschule of the university type, which would be so broad and all-inclusive as to give equal place to all religious realms and shades of thought, and whose professors should represent all possible views, however diametrically opposed to each other. And out of such an institute or Hochschule, Rabbis, preachers and teachers are to emanate who are to mould character and inspire reverence for God and things godly! Whatever measures be taken or means obtained for such an enterprise, the Hebrew Union College needs not fear competition. With its half century's tradition its completely reconstructed faculty as planned, and its Dormitory soon to be erected, and with a judicious management by its versatile and indefatigable Acting President, and with the rich experience of its high-aiming, devout and wise President and members of the Board of Governors, it will, under God's guidance, we trust, remain what it was hitherto under the presidency of its sainted founder and mine, the center and watch-tower of American Reform Judaism, safe and secure for all time.

And as the concluding word of the Priestly Blessing is Peace, so we hope will the future of the College be Peace, Harmony and Unity amid the conflicting views and elements of life. Yet this can only be brought about by that

higher idealism which means concentration by true spirituality in contrast to the materialistic tendencies of the age and to the traditionalism and radicalism prevailing in many scientific and social circles today.

But let my last word Peace be addressed to you, my dear boys. You are all familiar with the Rabbinical saying: "The disciples of the wise enhance the peace of the world, for it says: Let all thy children be disciples of the Lord and great will be the peace of thy children, who are to be the builders of the future." Stand firmly and unfalteringly on the watch-tower of Judaism by the banner of Israel's God. Make Reform Judaism in America a light-house of Israel's truth, a power-house of righteousness, a tree of life planted in the deep soil of the heart, so that amid the salubrious air of freedom it may arise to the lofty heights of the ideal, and spread its branches wide to impart its rich fruitage to a large world around. But above all, nurture in yourselves and others the spirit of earnestness and holiness, of faith and religiosity, and your crowning success will be Peace without and within.

In closing herewith a marked chapter of my public life, let me say to all of you somewhat in the language of Jacob our ancestor: Do not let me go hence, unless you bless me, as I herewith pronounce the priestly blessing upon you: May the Lord bless you and keep you: May the Lord let His countenance shine upon you and be gracious unto you! May the Lord turn His countenance to you and give you Peace! Amen.

THE FAITH OF REFORM JUDAISM

ONE may as well expect the color-blind to appreciate the paintings of a Titian and a Raphael, or one whose ear is deaf to the harmonies of music to take delight in the symphonies of a Mozart or a Beethoven, as to convince an unreasoning agnostic or determined skeptic of the sublime grandeur of Jewish monotheism. Much of the confusion and conflict that disturb the peace in our camps today is due to a state of mentality under which the religious sense is atrophied.

I have at all times cherished the warmest sympathy for young men in their critical stage of doubt and for every opinion honestly held, provided the sanctuary of religion be not assailed by frivolous scoffing and our ancestral heritage not wilfully dragged into the mire.

To many superficial observers Reform Judaism appears as a sort of diluted Judaism, one robbed of its pristine vigor or fervor of conviction and its genuine spirit. Taking the cue from its opponents, they believe that Reform Judaism owes its origin either to convenience, the desire of getting rid of burdensome precepts, whether Mosaic or Rabbinical, or to a certain compromise between the old and the new, a mere concession to modernity, such as the name *Liberal Judaism* vaguely suggests. So let me say then, first of all, that Reform Judaism insists, with every power at its command, on maintaining and preserving Judaism in all its essentials. The first question, then, to be considered, is What is Judaism? Is it a mere national concern? Is its aim and object to be in possession of a specific soil on which to unfold the cultural life of the Jew, or to develop a distinctive literature or art, a scientific, social, and industrial life of its own? Unless we play with the word, Judaism never was and never will be anything but the working out of the religious task mapped out in the Scriptures, first of all for Abraham the Hebrew ancestor of whom God said: "I have chosen him that he command his children and his house after him, to

observe the ways of the Lord and practice righteousness and justice in order to fulfill his destiny." It is the working out of the task set for the people of Israel, when they received their constitution at Mount Sinai: "Ye shall be unto them a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." It is the working out of the task laid out in the Decalogue and the whole code of law, and summed up for the scattered tribes of Judah in the words of the seer of the Exile: "You are My witnesses, saith the Lord." There can be no other standpoint for Judaism and Jew, whether Orthodox or Reform.

Reform Judaism represents a specific form or concept of Judaism. While deviating from old, venerable, Orthodox or traditional Judaism, it is by no means an arbitrary secession or schism. It came about as a historical necessity, in response to the demands of the time, just as did Rabbinical and Mosaic Judaism in their turn. Who with eyes open can deny that Talmudic Judaism, which with its Chinese wall of seclusion for the last two thousand years shielded the Jew and his faith against all hostile attacks of nations and creeds, is to-day everywhere declining and gradually withering away? The thousand and one paragraphs of the ancient Code of law had become dead letters at the very moment the Ghetto walls fell before the trumpet blast of liberty to admit the Jew into the citizenship of the nations in whose midst he lives, and all attempts of neo-Orthodoxy and the Romanticist to breathe new life into the dry bones proved in the end to be futile. From the beginning of the Mendelssohnian era and during the entire emancipation period that followed, the new culture and enlightenment was to the thousands of Jews what the flame is to the moth. They were dazed and fell away. But the fact is little recognized that when the tide of apostasy was at its height, Reform Judaism came and checked it, saying with the prophet Isaiah: "Though there be left but the tenth of it and even this be seared, the stock, the holy seed thereof, remains." Reform came not as a destroyer, but as a savior and regenerator. Orthodoxy clung and still clings to the shell, endangering thereby the kernel; Reform surrendered the unessential, the transient and ever-changing form, in order to preserve and unfold the perennial spirit, the ever-living

truth. It is and wants to be nothing else but Judaism revitalized—Judaism retranslated into the language, the spirit, and the world-view of our age.

And this is the point which is so little understood by many laymen and learned. Because it was cradled in the fatherland of the Reformation, people take it to be a sort of Jewish Reformation and speak of it as Reformed Judaism, as if it were a system of thought or creed fixed and finished by a rabbinical body who broke with the past. Reform Judaism constitutes no break with the past, but asserts that the principle of Reform and Progress, which it accentuates, was ever a potent force inherent in Judaism, only working unconsciously in former ages and now consciously applied in our age of historical research.

Reform Judaism is the necessary outcome of our age of *evolution*. At first the Reform movement was merely external. The old practices in synagogue and school-room, which were the concomitants of the Ghetto life, had to give way to forms more in harmony with modern culture and esthetical refinement, and innovations such as the sermon in the vernacular, choral song with organ accompaniment, and confirmation, were introduced and finally gained admission also in conservative congregations. But these by no means chiefly characterize Reform Judaism. Its principles were enunciated first and in epoch-making theological studies by Abraham Geiger, who, with fine divinatory insight, disclosed the significant fact that the various phases of Judaism, such as Prophetism, Mosaism, Pharisaism and Rabbinism, are the results of the varying historical forces and influences prevailing in all the different epochs, which incessantly worked changes and transformations in belief and practice. It is the recognition and application to our own time of this principle of progress and reform that constitutes the essence of Reform Judaism and forms the key-note of the Reform movement.

In order better to elucidate its principles, let me contrast them with those of Orthodoxy. The first and foremost principle of Orthodoxy is stability: The law, both written and oral, that has come down from God to Moses and from Moses to all succeeding generations, did not and can not

change. This is one of the thirteen fundamentals of traditional Judaism noted in the Maimonidean Creed. There is indeed something wonderful and inspiring in the belief that from the very dawn of history, under all the changes that have come over the nations, Israel's law should have ever remained the same. You have this very thought admirably expressed in the famous painting of Sargent in the Boston Library, where Moses stands forth with face and mien immovable as the rock of Sinai. It is a pity that this picture, conceived in a mediaeval spirit, is not true; nor are any of its prophetic characters—not to speak of the New Testament figures on the opposite side—correct from the viewpoint of modern research. We know better to-day. The real genius of the Jewish race manifested itself neither in the law, which is the work of many generations following the prophetic era, nor in those mystic visionaries pointing to the coming of a Messiah, as the Prophets are represented in the painting. It is as fiery uncompromising champions of justice and righteousness, of truth and mercy, of purity and holiness, that Israel's prophets voiced for all times the guiding principles of life for men and nations, and the Mosaic law is but a compromise between these prophetic ideals and the real needs of a nation, however inferior, that was to embody these truths in temple and State. Twice as a nation it failed to accomplish this great task, and instead, synagogue and school-room became the embodiment and shelter of the truths that were to become the saving power and the uniting force of mankind.

These truths have never remained the same. They never became altogether stagnant. They underwent constant changes, as all things in life do. The very tradition which the rabbis ascribe to Moses is, in fact, but a continuous re-interpretation of the letter of the law in accordance with the needs of the time,—a revitalization of Biblical laws and practices that had become lifeless and meaningless to a later generation. And this higher concept of Biblical and Rabbinical Judaism not only justified but demanded a reinterpretation, a remodeling of the whole religious life and belief of the Jew in our time. There are those who want these ancient forms preserved, on account of their pictures-

queness, and would have the Synagogue rendered a sort of museum of antiquities, in which the treasures of a hoary past, the armors and weapons and tools, and also the defunct bodies of races and rulers from of yore, should be kept intact, just as they were thousands of years ago. They forget that no current of air may be allowed to touch them, lest rust and moth eat them up. Religion is life. Its function is not to keep and galvanize forms that are dead. Life means progress and constant regeneration.

Here a number of other principles are involved. For Orthodoxy, God spoke only through men of the past, and only institutions hoary with age command its reverential regard. Hence its worship of the letter, its apotheosis of the authority of tradition. Laws that had long ago lost their meaning are declared by the rabbis to be decrees of God which human reason can not, and should not, endeavor to grasp. Reform Judaism claims reason to be the light of God, shining for all ages. Nor has the divine Revelation ended with the completion of the Torah and tradition, with Bible and the founders of the Synagogue. Just as the great Creator is ever at work in the cosmic world, so does the work of divine Revelation continue to move the spirit of men. Religion, in order to be a life force, must ever create new adequate forms, to embody its ever advancing ideas and ideals.

And here I touch upon the main issue between Orthodox and Reform Judaism. Restoration of the past in all its pristine glory, restoration of the State, of the whole nation of Judah and Israel under the reign of a son of David, restoration of the temple with its entire sacrificial mode of worship under the Aaronistic priesthood, with all its claims and privileges and its Levitical laws of purity and sanctity, restoration of the whole Mosaic law, a large portion of which had to be suspended during the Exile,—this is the hope and the aim and object of prayer of Orthodox Judaism. And mark well. This restoration is not to come through human initiative, through land purchase and pledges of foreign rulers. Against these the Talmud expressly warns the Jewish people. It is solely to be accomplished by the miraculous power of God, who will bring about the resurrec-

tion of the dead, the reappearance of Elijah and the arrival of the hidden Messiah, together with the hidden temple and its holy vessels. Against this expectation of a miraculous resurrection of the past Reform Judaism takes a stand, declaring that there is no such thing as resurrection in life or in history. We believe in a continuity of the spirit. The dead do not rise again, so far as we know. The seed that is buried in the soil undergoes a process of decomposition and transformation before it sprouts forth anew. Judaism was a new creation. It was no longer Israel's nation, but a people with a religious destiny, and with the fall of the second temple and State, the sacrificial cult and the priesthood ceased forever. God spoke again out of the fire and declared the Jewish people to be the martyr-priest of the nations, the *Messiah*, the suffering and the redeeming servant of God for the whole human world. The wandering Jew became after the pattern of Abraham, his prototype, the missionary of mankind. Far from being a misfortune or a punishment, as the ancient liturgy has it, the dispersion of the Jewish people over the world was the realization of its unique world-task to be a seed of blessing unto all families on earth.

This concept of Judaism, this mission of the Jew was first expressed by the great seer of the Exile, the so-called Second Isaiah, when he said that the scattered remnant of Israel shall be 'a light of the nations and a covenant of the peoples.' It was carried out in practice by the forerunners of Christianity, the Jews of Hellenic culture, that instituted a large propaganda to win the heathen world for the monotheistic faith and the ethical teachings of Judaism. And even where the proselyting spirit had been checked by the rabbis, on account of danger lurking within and without, one of the Talmudic sages, R. Eleazar, ventured to say that Israel's dispersion over the world had for its chief purpose the spreading of Israel's truth among the nations, in order to gain proselytes. But the underlying idea, the fundamental principle of Reform Judaism to be accentuated more than any other, is that Judaism is no more a national religion than its God is a tribal God. Universal as is the God of Israel, ever since the prophets proclaimed Him the

Fountain-head of Justice and Holiness, the King of the earth, and the Father of mankind, so is Judaism a universal system of truths and of ethics, destined to become the religion of humanity. As Israel's Book of Books begins history with man made in the image of God, so it points to the united human family, the brotherhood of man, as the goal of history. It is in the light of prophetic universalism that Reform Judaism reads the sacred scripture, the whole history and literature, the philosophy and other cultural achievements of the Jew. It is the groping and striving for the complete unfolding of the religious genius and ethical spirit, ever potent in him, with more or less force and fervor, manifested today more in philanthropic and humanitarian efforts but never altogether extinct.

Let me mention here another distinctive characteristic of Reform Judaism, in contrast to the guiding principle of Orthodoxy. Many of the Mosaic and Rabbinical laws had for their object to guard the Jewish people against the snare of idolatrous practices, which caused their frequent relapse into heathenism, and so separation was made the watchword of the ancient law-giver and the schools. Assimilation was the peril, and so association with non-Jews or any imitation of their modes of life was so far as feasible interdicted. And this wall of separation was kept up long after the cause had disappeared, and every form of assimilation, even in speech or dress, was denounced. And yet what made the Jew's wondrous vigor and freshness of mind and spirit possible, but the very faculty of assimilation? In assimilating the cultural elements of Babylonia and Persia, of Hellas and Rome, of Arabia and Spain, of Italy, Germany and France, he went ever anew through the process of regeneration. In adopting the forms of life from the civilizations surrounding him, and utilizing them for his intellectual and spiritual life, he not only found the fountain of regeneration for himself, but he became a vital and vitalizing factor for the culture and world-view of the people in whose midst he lived. How little understanding of Judaism is shown by some of the mouthpieces of Zionism, such as Zollschan, Ruppin and others, who tell us that Maimonides, Gabirol and Mendelssohn were destroyers of Judaism, because of

their blending of Jewish with Hellenic or Aryan ideas! Only when the Jew came in close touch with other civilizations, as was the case in Alexandria and in Spain, and again in these modern days, did he realize the real grandeur of his ancestral heritage, and become its zealous sponsor and propagator. Only in regard to mixed marriages Reform Judaism warns the Jew against being swallowed up by the majority and thereby losing his identity, which would mean the surrender of his faith and his mission to the world. Otherwise the Jew's place is *in* the world and *among* the nations. His task and scope are international, and not confined to a little territory he may call his own.

There is another point that must not be overlooked. There is truth in the words: *Ex Oriente lux*. The sun of truth, of religion, rose in the East. But did civilization in its westward march not advance to higher planes and higher standards of life? Orthodoxy adheres to the customs and practices, if not the view, of the Orient. Orientalism characterizes its divine service and still shapes its marriage and divorce laws, its whole legal attitude to woman. Reform Judaism, on the other hand, insists on the recognition of the demands of Occidental culture. It wants Jew and Jewess to be perfectly at home in our Western civilization and to be at one with their fellow-citizens, not an alien and a stranger with a foreign tongue, but in every respect an integral part of the nations among whom he lives, and for the welfare and ideals of which he, too, works and strives. Only rooted with all his sentiments, aims and hopes in the soil of America as a full citizen and patriot, can he bring the message of Judaism to the surrounding world. But here the question is asked: Has he a message to bring? Orthodoxy says he has a great memory to preserve. Zionism, forgetting that it is his God, his religious truths for which he ever suffered and bled, tells us he has a nationality to build up anew. Reform Judaism maintains that his whole wondrous past, with its unparalleled martyrdom and its achievements in every branch of culture, is but the preparation for the great Messianic future of mankind, not a national, but a cosmopolitan, a world Zion. In this direction lie our aims and ideals. What the rabbis say of Abraham, that he made

a disunited world *one* by proclaiming God as the Father of all, is in reality the scope and aim of Jew and Judaism. The Church and the Mosque, daughters of the Synagogue, have accomplished great things for the unification, education, and elevation of the human race. As Maimonides and Jehudah Halevi, the great mediaeval thinkers, say, they were the apostles sent forth by the God of Israel to bring the world nearer to the truths of Sinai. But their work is but a compromise, and preparatory, a mixture of light and darkness, of truth and falsehood, of the pure Jewish monotheism with heathen polytheism here and with Arabian fatalism there. Between Christian and Moslem the Jew ever stood and stands pointing to a higher truth and sounder ethics. And today in this terrible deluge of blood and woe which we witness, we see a rift in the clouds, we look for the dawn of a new day.

The world is in the birth-throes of a higher civilization, and in wait for a grander and deeper religious truth. The eyes of men are turned away from Europe to America, where out of the great melting pot of nations a new type of men and women is emerging, and again to the far East, where old countries are coming under the influence of modern ideas. Will Judaism have no share in this great transformation of man in the course of decades or centuries? Will he, who by his Book of Books and his great work in history laid the foundation of the civilization of East and West, not be called upon to help further in the rearing of the higher structure of humanity? Will the prophetic genius that revealed the secret of God and of man to the world not rise again to creative power and bring to realization the hope of a world united by the worship of its only One and holy God?

Shall a Jewish nation without God, or the cosmopolitan Jew *with* his God, achieve this great task, for which the centuries are waiting?

Reform Judaism in no way discourages the Jewish colonization of Palestine and adjoining lands, but it can only regard it as a philanthropic effort deserving general support. Nor must it needs disillusion those who dream of thereby creating a special Jewish type of art and culture

in the course of decades, as this has nothing to do with Judaism. But in the name of God and Israel's great past it denounces as *treason* the attempt of those who want to sell our birthright, our 4000-year-old spiritual inheritance, for a mess of pottage, for temporary and material consideration, and their American citizenship for a land in the clouds. The Zion to which, according to the prophetic words, the nations will pilgrimage to find God and go in His ways, will be on the top of the mountains,—that is, as the rabbis says, one mount of revelation, one height of ideals, will be piled upon the other, so that the ideal of all ideals will be attained. This ideal Zion of humanity not built by human hands, a spiritual Zion for all mankind, is the goal, the aim of Reform Judaism.

KADDISH: ITS ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE

I PROPOSE to speak to-night on a subject which I am sure interests most of those assembled here, and on which I have been enabled by recent studies of mine to throw some new light—the origin and significance of the Kaddish, the prayer for the dead. One who stands in the shadow of a great loss is, as a rule, disappointed, when expecting to receive a new ray of hope from the Kaddish prayer, he recites: “Hallowed and extolled be the great name of God. His kingdom come speedily and His peace be upon us, the departed and the living.” This is its whole content. What balm does this offer to a bleeding heart? The prayer has indeed no reference to the great problem of death. It is nothing but a glorification of God, and at best a surrender of the individual to the all-embracing wisdom of the benign Ruler of time and eternity.

The following legend, however, current in the Middle Ages, tells its own tale: “Rabbi Akiba, or according to another version, Johanan ben Zakkai, who witnessed the downfall of the second temple, once saw the shadowy figure of a man carrying a load of wood upon his shoulders, chafing and groaning under his load. ‘What aileth thee?’ asks the Rabbi. ‘I am one of those forlorn souls condemned for his sins to the agony of hell fire.’ ‘And is there no release for you?’ ‘Yes. If my little son, whom I left behind an infant, is taught to utter the praise of God in the assembly of worshipers, to make them echo the *Amen* throughout the world, then my sins will be forgiven.’ Whereupon the rabbi took care of the child and through the son’s piety the father obtained salvation.”

Now this story has its parallel in dozens of its kind set afloat by Christian monks of the Middle Ages, who, with pen and painter’s brush, pictured the ghastly scenes of hell and purgatory, to have people hold a hundredfold mass for the redemption of the soul of the dead. Dr. Zunz, the great Jewish historian, and other learned men after him,

were therefore quite positive in asserting that the Kaddish is nothing but an imitation of church custom. I have since long found many reasons to doubt this assertion, chiefly because the oldest Rabbinical authorities in the Talmud ascribe the greatest value to the recitation of the Kaddish. One goes so far as to say that the Kaddish has the power of breaking the iron gates of hell and of unlocking the doors of Paradise. And in illustration of this, a story is given: "When at the future day of judgment, the Messiah sings the praise of God and the pious respond in unison with the great Amen, the doomed in hell, in the midst of their agonies, will join in saying 'Amen. God is just!' And when this sound of Amen from the very depths of the world reaches God's throne on high, He will send his angels down to release the imprisoned and to clothe them with the garb of purity, in order to admit them into the circle of the just of all the nations in the city of the blessed."

Another rabbi of the Talmud finds in the Amen of the Kaddish the lever and pillar of the entire world. Now, making all possible allowances for Oriental exaggeration, these learned men must have found some sublime truth conveyed in the Kaddish. And what is it? No doubt, it is the humble recognition on the part of the short-sighted mortal, that in all the trials and tribulations God imposes on man, He is just, beyond measure, and in all our experiences, be they sweet or bitter, we owe Him but praise and glory like the angels that carry His majestic throne above, amidst perpetual anthems of Holy, Holy, Holy!

This, then, is the purport of the Kaddish. It says to each grief-worn soul: "Murmur not! Complain not! Falter not in thy faith in the Most High. In Him is life eternal. Before His throne there is no longer darkness nor destruction, nor woe nor wrong, but light and bliss and goodness everlasting! All the discord and dissonances below, end in harmonious symphony here. All the rainbow colors upon the cloud-curtain overhanging our horizon, unite in the dazzling brightness of the Sun of Righteousness above."

Still, friends, I was not certain that my interpretation was authentic and not colored by my own sentiment, until quite recently I came across a beautiful Greek work which

was brought to light lately by Christian scholars in England, and of which I will give you the substance in the following. The book, an old Jewish Midrash, was known before any of the Talmudical works were written, under the name of Revelation of Abraham, and since then lost.

Abraham, the beloved friend of God, the protector of the poor and the friend of strangers;—so the story begins—had reached the age allotted to him, and God sent His Archangel Michael to him to prepare him for the last great journey. Michael came as a guest under his hospitable roof, and as he did not want to tell the sad tidings directly, God caused Isaac to have a dream which the angel interpreted for Abraham so as to break the news to him. But Abraham, like Moses in a similar Midrash, clung to life with all his heart and would not give up his soul. "Under one condition," he finally said, "I am willing to follow thee and surrender my soul to God, if thou wouldst first show me the entire management of God's kingdom here and hereafter, earth and sea, heaven and hell, so that I may die in peace, without fear and without trouble and doubt."

At God's bidding, the Archangel Michael then took the heavenly chariot with the fiery cherubim upon a cloud and rode with Abraham high above the globe, so that with one celestial glance he could espy and watch all the doings of men on earth. All the grief and all the gladness, all the changing scenes of weal and of woe were surveyed in one instant.

Yet while with his deep human sympathy, rejoicing with the one and sorrowing with the other, he saw also swords and slanderous tongues, violence and fraud, crime and hypocrisy, doing great havoc and destroying the peace of households and states, in his mighty wrath he cried forth: "O God of Justice, let fire from heaven fall upon the sowers of discord! Let the wild beasts come out of the forest and eat up these robbers! Let the earth open her mouth and swallow the peace-breakers, the adulterers!" And lo! no sooner was the word said, than the fiery darts did fall upon the slanderers, and the wild beasts devoured the robbers, and the quaking houses buried the breakers of the marriage vow under their ruins. But then a voice came

down from on high, saying: "Stop thine ride, Archangel Michael, lest Abraham, the sinless man, destroy the entire universe with his fire of just indignation. He knows not that the world is sustained only by grace and long-suffering. Go hence and drive through the other gate that he may see my mode of meting out justice." And Michael took Abraham to the place where heaven and earth reach near the fathomless waters of the ocean. There were two roads, the one wide, leading to a broad gate, which opened out into a path downwards to darkness, the other narrow, leading to a narrow gate which opened out into a path upwards to the light. On the wide road, multitudes of souls driven by angels rushed along in endless procession. On the other, but few marched, with stately steps. Between these two roads, a royal figure was seated on a golden throne, now weeping and shrieking in wild lamentation as he saw the large procession on his left, and again smiling and exulting in joy over the few that passed onward to the narrow gate. It was Adam who watched the fate of his children. Few were privileged to enter Paradise.

The majority were sinners and, therefore, doomed to suffer. Farther inwards between the gates of Paradise and Hell, Adam's son, the first innocent sufferer among mortals, Abel, sat at the judgment seat with a three-fold golden crown upon his head; before him an angel holding the scales of justice; and another holding a reed with a live coal in her hand, the one to weigh and the other to test each passing soul, while two other angels, with pen and ink and a scroll to read the record of each life and write down its destiny; hundreds of angels, bright and gloomy, waiting for the verdict to execute it, until God would some day pass the final judgment at the world's end. And while Abraham watched this wondrous procedure with intense interest, a single soul was led along by an angel and placed right in the middle between the two roads. "What about this single soul?" Abraham inquired of his heavenly guide. "This soul has just about the same number of good deeds as bad deeds in the record, the scales deciding neither for Paradisical bliss nor for punishment, though the smallest good work as light as a feather might turn the balance in

its favor." Then Abraham, the kind-hearted, who had once prayed for the sinners of Sodom, fell on his knees and prayed to the All-Merciful God for the redemption of that single soul, and told Michael to join him in his holy prayer, and instantly the soul was ushered into Paradise. Upon seeing this, Abraham burst forth into the glorification of God; in other words, he recited the *Kaddish*: Holy, Holy, Holy is God. And seeing now how awfully he had sinned, by the curses he had on his heavenly ride hurled upon the wicked, he said to Michael: "Oh, Archangel, join me in invoking God's mercy upon those poor sinners whom my imprudent rashness has precipitated into death and deprived of the opportunity of repenting." Abraham, joined by the Archangel, then prayed for those sinners and they, too, were saved.

I shall not continue the story, however interesting it may be, of Abraham's end, but desire to call your attention to the fact that what the Midrash here relates of Abraham—the same journey through the Inferno and Paradise as painted by Dante's immortal pen—was in a later Christian apocryphal writing described by St. Peter, the apostle of Jesus; and the discovery of the same, made the other day, caused quite a sensation throughout learned Christendom. Here is not the place to enter into inquiries belonging to the resort of scholars, but you can here see for yourselves how it came that Abraham occupies the same place as patron of the Jewish people and as guardian of Paradise in the Jewish mind as St. Peter, the door-keeper of Heaven, does in the Christian legend.

On one distinctive feature of the Jewish belief, however, I desire to lay great stress.

In the midst of a healthy, active life, bright with prospects and hopes, we dislike to ponder over the dark beyond. The prophets and teachers of Judaism based religion and ethics upon life on earth, upon the divine kingdom of justice and kindness, to be established by men toiling and striving in the world that now is; and so did the Jews as a people and as a religious sect never care to pry into the secrets of the hereafter.

Once on the path of right and allied with God here

means righteousness and blessedness forever! That very picturesque scene of the judgment in the netherworld which I have endeavored to sketch, was, characteristically enough, transferred by the rabbis to heaven above, to take place there, if not every day, at least every New Year's day, to determine life's destinies *here* on earth already, while the other passed out of the memory of the Jewish sages. Not so with the church. Antiquity's nations, Egypt, Babylon, and Persia, Greece and Rome, had become old and exhausted. Life had lost its charm for the serious-minded, for their living faith had died away. The grave rose in solemn importance, and the great concern of all religious and philosophical systems was only the question what would be the fate of the soul after death. This was the great opportunity of the Church. It took hold of the despairing world. The Cross made death easy. It planted a sign of victory, a branch of the tree of Paradise upon the tomb, pointing to a life beyond. It pronounced a new world begun with its Saviour's resurrection. This life was doomed, the new life had come out of death for all those who believed in the Saviour crucified. George Eliot calls Christianity 'other-worldliness,' and justly so. Only Protestantism called the mind of man back again to the duty of life here, and unbelief is but the fruit or drift of this great reaction. Once a stately woman was seen striding along the earth with a pitcher full of water in her one hand, and with a flaming torch in the other. "With one," she said, "I want to extinguish the fires of hell, with the other I shall set fire to Paradise." This is what Rationalism has been doing all along.

But if there be no hell nor heaven except in our own bosom, if there be no purgatory unless in our own conscience, if we have come to the conviction that eternal bliss and doom, in order to be truly just, must be meted out in different proportions than we were hitherto taught, what about the *Kaddish*? All the more, I say, must we learn in true humility to bow before the majestic throne of God and join the heavenly chorus singing 'Holy!' and 'Amen!' and 'Hallelujah!' in praise of the Sublime Ruler of Destinies, whether we understand his ways or fail with our

tear-shrouded eyes to see our way ahead. All the more must we patiently submit and surrender to a wisdom that outshines our little brain as does the immensity of heaven the compass of our eye and the farthest-reaching telescope. This is the meaning of Kaddish: However frail and small our life's bark is, we can yet with the wings of divine thought fly into the arms of God and feel safe, and outshine sun and seraph in the praise of the World's King. But one truth more is implied in the *Kaddish*: While generations come and go, while ages and views, life and forms bloom and fade, wax and wane, the soul clings with faith and hope to One that changes not and grows not old. And in this cry, 'Holy!' and 'Amen!' there is the galvanic thread that binds the ages and æons together, and keeps the departed alive. The work interrupted by death is continued by the living, and the task left undone by us is accomplished by those that follow us. Kaddish voices the sentiment: Sacred is the toiling, the striving, the working, the blessing of the ages, since the ever-living, the Most Holy God forms the indissoluble link of the past and the future of worlds without end.

Is it enough, then, simply to remember in reverential love the dear ones during the year of mourning, and once again each coming year, and then sever the links that bind heart to heart and the sacred spot of the sanctuary to our home and to life without, dropping temple and religion, and Sabbath day and all its holy remembrances out of mind and out of sight? THAT Kaddish truly is a mockery, a farce, an illusion, a blasphemy. Kaddish, if it is to have a meaning, must emblazon our whole life with the glow of eternal beauty of love and hallow it with Sabbatical peace and bliss, forever to bind us and our household to our vow of pious love and devotion, to the sacred memories of the past, and to the glorious hopes of the future, thus sealing our entire life with the words engraved upon the priest's diadem—'holy unto God.' Amen.

PHILO—ODER JUDENTHUM UND GRIECHISCHE PHILOSOPHIE

WIE der Baumeister zu einem grossen Palaste die grössten Quadersteine zu Ecksäulen aussucht und ihnen die Form verleiht, die dem Stil des Gebäudes am meisten entsprechen, so stellt die Geschichte an ihren hervorragenden Wendepunkten immer eine Persönlichkeit als Eckstein auf, die recht augenfällig das Gepräge der Zeit trägt und den Uebergang zu einer neuen Gestaltung bietet, indem sie der ganzen bisherigen Geistesbewegung eine neue Richtung anweist. Das sind die grossen Männer, die Repräsentanten einer neuen Epoche in der Geschichte. Zu diesen zählt auch der Weise, dem wir unsere heutigen Betrachtungen widmen: Philo von Alexandrien. Mit ihm erreichte das griechisch-jüdische Geistesleben seinen Gipfelpunkt und Abschluss, um mit einem Arm in die absterbende griechische Philosophie, mit dem andern in's neuerstehende Christenthum einzumünden, während der mittlere Arm dem Judenthum seine Gedankenfrische und Elasticität erhielt. Philo's Gedankensystem hat dem absterbenden Stamm der griechischen Philosophie als neues Pfropfreis gedient, das neue Blüthen trieb. Es hat dem aus der Hefe des Volkes sich bildenden Christenthum Alles gegeben, was es zu seiner Existenz bedurfte: Geist und Form. Philo hat dem Judenthum zum ersten Male gegeben, was es noch nicht hatte: eine Philosophie.

Jüdische Philosophie! Schon diese Benennung verräth einen Widerspruch. Philosophie ist die Kunst zu denken. Die ist weder jüdisch noch heidnisch. Die Vernunft ist rein menschlich. Eine religiöse Vernunft oder einen gemüthlichen Verstand gibt es nicht. Der Verstand urtheilt nach kalten Gesetzen des Denkens, das Gemüth nach seinen warmen Empfindungen. Welche von beiden Richtungen der Seele die bessere und edlere ist, das lässt sich gerade so leicht bestimmen, als welche von den beiden Blutströmungen im menschlichen Organismus wichtiger sei, die

nach dem Hirn oder die nach dem Herzen hinwärtslaufende, oder welche von den beiden Luftströmungen für das Erdenleben die bessere sei, die vom südlichen Golf ausgehende warme, oder die vom Nordpol kommende kalte. Offenbar erhalten und schaffen beide durch ihre Wechselwirkung das Leben, und wo die eine überwiegt, muss ein Kampf das Gleichgewicht wieder herstellen. Die Berührung von Religion und Philosophie setzt nothwendig einen Kampf voraus. Von Haus aus ist das jüdische Volk nicht zum freien kalten Denken angelegt. Die warme Empfindung, das Subjective, überwiegt in der Sprache wie im Charakter der Semiten, gerade wie umgekehrt bei den Söhnen Japhet's die Religion die sinnlichen Formen abstreifen und sich vergeistigen könnte. Die Griechen schufen ihre Götter nach dem Ebenbild des Menschen, und so entstand die Kunst. Sie fassten die Welt in menschliche Denkformen, und so entstand die Philosophie. Der jüdische Volksgeist empfand Gott als das unendliche, übersinnliche Wesen, dem gegenüber das ganze Weltall wie Thon in des Töpfers Hand ist. Die Frage, was Gott sei, mit der die Philosophen sich durch Jahrtausende nutzlos abquälen, lassen die jüdischen Propheten ganz bei Seite. Sie stellen nur an's eigene Innere die Frage: Wie gibt Er sich kund? Und die Antwort lautet: als sittliches, als gütiges, gerechtes, sündenbestrafendes oder Milde and Gnade übendes Wesen, als Richter, als Herrscher, als Vorsehung, als Vater! Freilich sollte man meinen, Religion und Philosophie könnten sich ganz gut miteinander vertragen. Die Philosophie könnte als Himmelsleiter dienen, die den Verstand von der niedersten Staffel der Wesen und Kräfte bis zur höchsten und letzten Ursache, zum Gottesthron aufsteigen liesse, und die Religion könnte umgekehrt das Himmelsthor öffnen, durch das die sittlichen Mächte, die Gebote der Gerechtigkeit und Liebe als Gottesboten zur Erde herabsteigen, um den Menschen auf seiner Bahn zu geleiten. Allein so bescheiden, mit solcher Klarheit und Sicherheit treten eben Beide nicht auf.

Wie haben denn die Propheten, ein Moses und Jesaias, an Gott jene sittlichen Eigenschaften entdeckt, die Ihn uns zum Vorbild, zum Ideal unsrer eigenen Natur machen? Wieso erkannten sie, dass Gott gerecht, langmüthig und

gütig sei? Offenbar, indem sie ihre eigenen Empfindungen in Gottes Natur verlegten, oder das Beste und Edelste ihres Gemüthes als Ausfluss Gottes empfanden. Sie mussten also Gott mit menschlichen Empfindungen ausstatten, wie das die Bibel in der kindlichsten, naivsten Weise thut. Um ihn als strengen Richter oder liebenden Vater darzustellen, mussten sie ihm bald Zorn und bald Reue, hier Schmerz und Verdross und dort Jubel beilegen—lauter menschlich-sinnliche Eigenschaften, die mit dem vernünftigen Denken unvereinbar sind. Und umgekehrt drängte der griechische Philosophenverstand mit den rohen Göttergestalten auch den unsichtbaren Gott aus der Welt hinaus und wies ihm höchstens im oberen Himmelsraum ein stilles Plätzchen an, wo er in keiner Beziehung zum Weltganzen und Einzelnen, zur Menschheit und zum Menschenherzen mehr stand und weder als König noch als Richter und Vater mehr angebetet werden konnte. Hier führte also keine Brücke von der Bibel zur Philosophie.

Seht da den Finger Gottes! Die Brücke wurde gebaut von Alexander dem Grossen, dem Schüler des grössten aller Griechen, des Aristoteles, dem kühnen Eroberer, der mit einem Schwert und Scepter das Morgenland und Abendland, ja die drei Welttheile zu einem grossen Reich verband und, indem er die griechische Bildung zum weltbefruchtenden Strome machte, die Geistesströme verschiedener Länder in einem grossen Weltmeer der Kultur vereinigte. Das grösste und bleibendste Denkmal, das er sich gesetzt, war die von ihm an Egyptens Meeresstrand erbaute Stadt Alexandrien, die für die Pflege der Wissenschaft mehr geleistet hat als irgend eine Stadt der Welt. Die ersten Einwohner dieser neuen und zur Handelsmetropole der Welt bestimmten Stadt waren Hellenen und Juden. Juden wie Griechen hatten sich an den Feldzügen Alexanders betheiligt und empfingen dafür Land und Bürgerrecht in der neuen Stadt. Eine beträchtliche Zahl von Juden kämpfte im Heer des ersten Ptolomäers, des Nachfolgers Alexander's, und wurde dafür mit dem schönsten Theil der aufblühenden Stadt, der an der Meeresküste lag und zum Seehandel wie geschaffen war, belohnt. Nicht nur kam jetzt der grosse Welthandel, namentlich der mit

Getreide, in die Hände der Juden; nicht nur bewährten diese sich als tüchtige Ackerbauer, als geschickte Handwerker und als vorzügliche tapfere Soldaten; sie wurden gar bald auch mit der griechischen Sprache, Denkart und Bildung vertraut. Das Bedürfniss entstand, die Bibel in griechischer Sprache zu besitzen und in der Synagoge verlesen zu hören.

Mit Recht lässt die Sage den Tag, an dem die griechische Bibelübersetzung unter dem zweiten Ptolomäer zu Stande gekommen, festlich von den Alexandrinern begangen sein. Es war ja eine neue Offenbarung der Lehre des Ewig-Einzigen an die Griechen, die Träger der Weltbildung. Diese griechische Bibel war der erste Apostel des Judenthums an die Heidenwelt, um sie zum Gott des Geistes hinzuführen. Sie hat das Judenthum in die Weltliteratur eingeführt und es aus seiner Abgeschlossenheit an's Licht des Tages gebracht.

Vergegenwärtigt Euch einmal die grosse Weltstadt, den Mittelpunkt des Welthandels, den Stapelplatz der Producte Indiens und Arabiens, Persiens und Egyptens, in dem die verschiedensten Racen der Menschheit sich begegneten, zum Sitz der grossartigsten Bücherschätze der Welt, zum lockendsten Aufenthalt der Gelehrten aus allen Ländern von edlen, wissensdurstigen Königen erhoben. Hier hatte griechisches Wissen erst seinen üppigen Boden gefunden. Hier schrieb Euklid, der Vater der Mathematik, sein ausserordentliches Werk. Hier schuf Eratosthenes und später Ptolemäus die erste systematische Geographie. Hier erreichte die Medicin, die Anatomie, die Pflanzen- und Thierkunde in den Museen ihre erste Blüthezeit. Hier erforschte man zum ersten Mal die Sprache und Kultur des Alterthums. Ein Durst nach Wissen gab sich kund, der Alle Fürsten und Priester, Gelehrte und Hofleute, beschäftigte. Die Bildung lag auf der Strasse. Alle Welt studirte, disputirte, philosophirte. Die Gelehrten Babyloniens, Indiens, Phöniziens, Griechenlands und Egyptens suchten ihre Ideen und Ueberlieferungen als die höchsten anzuweisen und in Geschichtswerken darzustellen. Jeder wollte sein Volk und seine Religion im besten Licht erscheinen lassen. Natürlich suchte man die albernen Göttergeschich-

ten, die lächerlichen Mythen, von denen die heidnische Religion und Kunst voll war, in Bilder und Allegorien umzu-deuten und die tiefste Weisheit darin zu finden. So trat an Stelle des alten naiven Glaubens an die Göttergeburten und Götterkämpfe eine seltsame Vermischung und Ver-quickung von Religion und Philosophie. Es war wirklich ein schönes kosmopolitisches Dichten und Trachten. Schade nur, es war kein Leben drin. Es war kein Licht, sondern blos Phosphorescenz von faulendem Holz; es war kein Leben, sondern nur das Wuchern von buntem Schlingege-wächs auf morschen Baumstumpfen. Was die griechische Fabel vom Riesen Anthäus erzählt, dass er unbezwingbar ist, so lange er auf dem Boden steht, vom Boden aufgehoben aber ohnmächtig hinfällt, das gilt vom ganzen Heidenthum. Das ganze Alterthum wurzelte im Staatsleben, in der Nation. Durch die Verbrüderung der Menschen sank die Vielgötterei unaufhaltsam dahin.

Ganz anders erging's dem Judenthum. Das trat ja mit dem Anspruch auf, die Welt seinem Gottesgedanken zu erobern. Es trat allen heidnischen Religionen als überlegene Geistesmacht gegenüber. Sie erbleichten vor seinem Glanze, wie Kerzenlichter vor der Sonne. Alexandrien stand zum ersten Mal einem Gegner gegenüber, der ihm Achtung einflösste, der es stutzig machte. Konnten oder wollten die Juden in dem grossen Geisterwettkampf, dem Gedankenumschwung, der sich da vollzog, zurückstehen? Sie wurden von der kräftigen Strömung ergriffen und in die gleiche Bahn geistiger Regsamkeit und Forschung gelenkt. Sie versenkten sich mit steigender Lust in die Tiefen griechischer Wissenschaft und tranken mit Wohlbehagen aus dem Kastalischen Quell der Musen. Aber werden der Sinai und Parnassus sich so rasch verschwistern? Werden Moses und Plato, David und Orpheus sich sogleich die Bruderhand reichen? Das Wunderbare geschah in der That. Wie man Moses und Abraham im griechischen Gewand auf der Alexandrinischen Bühne auftreten liess, so legt man Moses platonische Gedanken in den Mund. Man sah in Dina die Helena und in Schechem die Stadt Troja wieder, liess Orpheus und Hesiod jüdische Lehren predigen und stempelte Pythagoras und andere griechische Denker zu Schülern

Moses'. Jüdische Dichter und Denker versuchten den griechischen Genius der Philosophie und jüdischen Geist der Religion zu versöhnen. Jedoch, wie wenn zwei gewaltige Luftschichten, die eine vom sonnigen Süden, die andere vom eisigen Norden kommend, nur im Sturm und Wetter, im Donnergetöse und Blitzentladungen sich gegeneinander messen, so ging's auch hier nicht ohne Sturm und entscheidenden Kampf ab. Palästina bildete den Kampfplatz, Antiochus der Syrerkönig zündete die Kriegsflagge, und die Makkabäerhelden errangen den Sieg. Aber glaubet ja nicht, dass Priester vom Hause Aaron's, die sadducäischen Hohepriester zu Verräthern an Gott, Staat und Tempel geworden waren und zum rohen Götzendienste ihre Hand geliehen hatten, wenn nicht eben die griechische Scheinbildung unter dem Deckmantel einer weltverbrüdernden Philosophie Zweifel in ihre Herzen geworfen hätte, wenn nicht gerade wie heutigentags so Viele irregeworden waren an der Bibel und ihren Lehren und deshalb die fremde, glänzende Tagesweisheit vorziehen zu müssen gemeint hätten.

Gar leicht kann man ja aus der Bibel herauslesen, dass Gott Augen, Ohren und Gesicht, Hände und Füße, dass er menschliche Gestalt und Eigenschaften habe, dass er gehen, vom Himmel herabsteigen und geschaut werden könne. Und so erscheint gar manche Erzählung und Vorschrift befremdlich und unannehmbar. Während nun das blutbenetzte Schwert der Makkabäer dem Judenthum nach Aussen Sieg verlieh, war es der funkelnde Strahl der Wahrheit in der Hand jüdischer Lehrer und Weisen, der den höheren Geisteskampf vollbrachte. Die Fessel des Bibelbuchstabens wurde gesprengt. Der Geist entfaltet frei die Schwingen. Die Bibeldeutung begann, und in dem faltenreichen Gewand des Midrasch fanden die philosophischen Ideen Griechenlands Raum. Man lustwandelte in den Gärten der Halakah wie in der schattenreichen Musenallee Platos. Wo die Bibel von Gottes Hand sprach, da war die Allmacht gemeint; wo von Gottes Fuss die Rede ist, da ward sein Herabreichen in die Erdenwelt verstanden. Es war nicht mehr Gott, der vom Himmel herabstieg, sondern seine Herrlichkeit ward bloß dem Menschen sichtbar. Es

war nicht mehr sein Mund, der sprach, sondern sein Gedanke, seine Weisheit, die vermittelte. So wurde denn alles Kindliche und Sinnliche zum Ausdruck höherer Gedanken, zum Sinnbild tieferer Wahrheiten. Ist in der Bibel vielfach von Engeln die Rede, die an Gottes Statt handeln, nun, so sagte man, das sind die Ideen, die himmlischen Urbilder, von denen Plato sagte, dass sie im Reiche des Gedankens dasselbe sind, was die irdischen Dinge im Reiche der Sinnlichkeit. So wurde die Erzählung der Schöpfung der Welt in 6 Tagen dahingedeutet, dass sie sagen will, Gott hat die Welt nach dem Plan der Weisheit geschaffen und mit dem Siegel der Vollendung versehen. Und so erklärte man die Paradiesessage und die meisten Sagen als sinnbildliche Darstellungen höherer Ideen. Wurde ja gerade damit die jüdische Lehre vom Einen Gott immer mehr vergeistigt und geklärt und ebenso auch das Gebot der Sittlichkeit immer mehr vertieft und verinnerlicht. Ohne Frage war jener Antigonus ein Jünger der griechischen Philosophie, der den Grundsatz aussprach: Thut nich das Gute um des Lohnes halber, wie Knechte, die blos um Lohn dem Meister dienen! Selbst der Gedanke der Unsterblichkeit der Seele fasst auch im Judenthum erst durch die Lehre Plato's statt des leiblichen Wiederauferstehungsglaubens tiefe Wurzeln. In den allgemeinen Prinzipien Weisheit und Tugend, Vernunft und Güte begegneten sich ja der Jude und der Grieche. Man steuerte also auf eine Versöhnung der beiden Lehrer Moses und Plato hin, und diese wurde dann von Philo zum vollen System der Philosophie erhoben.

In der Schilderung seines Lebens wie seiner Lehre können wir uns kurz fassen. Er war Zeitgenosse des Stifters des Christenthums—er wurde nur 20 Jahre früher geboren aus einer der angesehensten und reichsten priesterlichen Familien in Alexandrien. Sein Bruder Alexander war Oberhaupt der jüdischen Gemeinde und liess einmal die Thore des Tempels zu Jerusalem mit Gold belegen. Er selbst genoss eine edle Erziehung, wurde früh in alle Wissenschaften eingeweiht, als die Gebieterin aller verehrte er aber die Philosophie. Dennoch band er alle Blumen, die er in ihrem Garten pflückte, zum Kranze zusammen, ganz allein, um damit die Lehre Moses, die höchste Weisheit zu schmücken.

In schwärmerischer Begeisterung wollte er gleichsam mit Sonne und Mond einen Wettlauf eingehen um den Gottesthron. Auf Ehre, Vergnügen und irdische Güter verzichtend, gab er sich dem beschaulichen Leben hin und schaute auf die Laster und Thorheiten der Menschen wie auf ein Räthsel der Menschennatur herab. Nur auf Andringen seines Bruders liess er sich überreden, ein Amt in der Gemeindeverwaltung oder dem Synhedrion zu übernehmen, wo er als der Weise in besonderer Achtung stand. Seine Frau war so stolz auf seinen Gesinnungsadel, dass sie einmal gefragt, warum sie keinen glänzenden Schmuck wie die übrigen reichen Frauen trage, antwortete: "Meines Mannes Tugend ist mein schönster Schmuck." Einmal war, in Folge des Neids, den der Wohlstand der Juden bei den Griechen erregte, ein gewaltiger Aufruhr gegen die jüdische Gemeinde in Alexandrien ausgebrochen, ihre herrlichen Synagogen wurden gestürmt und zerstört. Die lügenhaftesten Anklagen und Verleumdungen wurden gegen sie erhoben. Man wollte sie zwingen das Bild des römischen Kaisers in der Synagoge anzubeten, und als sie sich dagegen weigerten, verklagte man sie bei dem geisteszerütteten Kaiser Kaligula, der nun wirklich befahl, dass sie ihn als Gott verehren müssten. Natürlicherweise verweigerten sie den Gehorsam, und zur Abwendung der drohenden Gefahr wurde Philo als der glänzende Redner mit seinem Bruder, dem Fürsten oder Alabarchen und noch anderen jüdischen Notabeln nach Rom zum Kaiser gesandt, der aber den Fürsten ins Gefängniss werfen liess und den edlen Philo mit närrischem Hohn behandelte, so dass dieser vom Hofe mit den Worten schied: Gott wird helfen, zu ihm wollen wir das Vertrauen nicht verlieren. Mehr als je war ihm durch diesen Misserfolg die Ehre und Vertheidigung des Judenthums allen seinen Feinden gegenüber Herzenssache geworden. Was er mit glänzender Beredsamkeit seinen jüdischen Hörern in seinen Vorträgen darlegte, das setzte er in seinen verschiedenen Schriften, meistens Erklärungen der mosaischen Erzählungen und Gesetze, in lieblicher, oft rührender und hinreissender Sprache auseinander. Mit der ganzen Literatur der Griechen vertraut, vergleicht er die mosaische Gesetzgebung mit den heidnischen Sitten und

Lehren, um zu zeigen, wie der göttliche Moses wie ein Riese alle Heidenphilosophen überragt, wie sein Gesetz die reinsten Wahrheit und höchste Sittlichkeit predigt. Wie, ruft er aus, das Judenthum, das Milde gegen Sträflinge, Wohlthätigkeit gegen Fremde, Liebe gegen Arme, ja gegen Thiere und Pflanzen Mitgefühl und Theilnahme fordert, das sei menschenfeindlich! Dieselbe Achtung, die er, ein besserer Grieche, als Hebräer, für die Lehre Moses empfand, wollte er der Mit- und Nachwelt abringen für das Buch, aus dem, wie er meinte, Solon und Lycurg, Pythagoras und Plato ihre Weisheit geschöpft haben. Dieses Bestreben aber, das göttliche Buch zu verherrlichen, führte ihn wie die ganze Richtung, deren Hauptrepräsentant er war, dahin, in den einfachen Worten und Erzählungen die erhabenste und verborgenste Weisheit zu finden. So bedeuten ihm die vier Ströme des Paradieses die vier Haupttugenden, und die fünf Städte von Sodom die fünf Sinne des Menschen, Kain das fortschreitende Laster, und Schet die Erhebung der Jugend, Abraham die Lauterkeit und Sarah die Frömmigkeit, Isaac die Naturfreude und Jacob den geprüften Charakter, Rahel die Unschuld und Pharao die Gottlosigkeit u. s. w. Selbst die Gesetze deutet er alle als Symbole, wenn er auch, im Gegensatz zu Anderen, die überhaupt bloß die Idee festhalten wollten und die Form selbst des Sabbathgesetzes bei Seite schoben, auf die Beobachtung der Gebote als des Leibes für die Seele der Lehre bestand.

In diesem Allen jedoch folgte er nur dem Zug der Zeit oder des alexandrinischen Geistes. Darin zeigte sich noch nicht seine Originalität. Diese bestand in seinem philosophischen System, in dem zum ersten Mal in der Geschichte eine Vermählung des jüdischen Offenbarungsgedankens mit der heidnischen Philosophie versucht wird. Für das ganze Heidenthum, auch die Denker desselben im Alterthum wie in der Neuzeit, sind Gott und Welt unzertrennlich. Entweder Gott ist ein Stück von der Welt, oder die Welt ein Stück von Gott, und da kann von einer Schöpfung, Offenbarung und Vorsehung keine Rede sein. Für das Judenthum dagegen ist Gott eine über die Welt erhabene Persönlichkeit und die Welt Seine Schöpfung, Seiner Leitung unterworfen. In dem einen System führt keine Leiter von

der Welt hinauf zum Urquell und Ursprung, in dem anderen keine von Oben, vom Urgeist herab zur Welt, zum sinnlichen Stoff! Da setzte nun Philo das Schöpferwort, Logos, die Gottesvernunft, den Gotteswillen als Vermittler zwischen dem hoch über der Welt thronenden unbegreiflich und unaussprechlich heiligen Gott und der rohen, unreinen Materie. Der Gottes-Wille als Urbild und Weltenplan ist der erstgeborene Sohn Gottes, der in die Welt eingreift, als Schöpfer und Regent wirkend, von den Ideen oder dienenden Kräften, in der Bibel Engel genannt, wie der Monarch von seinem Hofstaat umgeben. Durch ihm, den göttlichen Verstand, tritt denn auch der Mensch in nahe Beziehung zu Gott. Sein Ebenbild und Abglanz ist der Menscheng Geist, eingekerkert im vergänglichen Leib, aber auf den Schwingen der Freiheit sich zu Gott zu erheben fähig und daher zu göttlichem, das ist unsterblichem Leben berufen. Durch Begeisterung und Verückung mag der Fromme sogar den Gottessohn selbst, die himmlische Weisheit, erreichen und das Wahre und Gute in vollkommenster Weise erkennen, wie das Moses und die Propheten gethan, durch welche Gott in Israel das wahre Vorbild des echten Menschen darstellen liess und dem jüdischen Volke als Musterstamm der Menschheit in seiner messianischen Mission die Lehre des reinen Menschenthums anvertraute. Was nun einzelne griechische Philosophenschulen an Sittenlehren und Jugendprinzipien aufstellten, das suchte Philo in dem Gesetzbuch Moses' als längst und eindringlich betont nachzuweisen.

Er war ein ebenso echter Jünger der Griechen als ein glühender, begeisterter Anhänger des Judenthums. Er hatte mit seinem ganzen Denken, Fühlen und Streben wie Wirken viel Aehnlichkeit mit Moses Mendelssohn. Vielleicht aber auch in dem Punkte, dass sein System, gerade wie das Mendelssohn'sche, zu schwach war, um zwei so gewaltige Geistesströmungen in einem so kleinen Bette zusammenzuhalten. Philo schob zwischen Gott und Welt und zwischen Gott und Mensch einen Sohn Gottes und stellte damit nicht eine Einheit und Versöhnung her zwischen Judenthum und Heidenthum, sondern schlug eine Brücke für's Christenthum, das seinen Christus zum Sohn erhob und durch seine Trinität den Monotheismus mit der heidnischen

Vielgöttereı auszugleichen suchte. Philo's Name ging der jüdischen Welt auf 15 Jahrhunderte hinaus verloren. Seine Philosophie ward vergessen und nur in kleinen Trümmern und Bruchstücken wurden seine Bibelauslegungsweisen theils durch jüdische, meistens durch christliche Vermittlung auf grosse jüdische Denker des Mittelalters verpflanzt. Ohne es zu wissen und zu wollen, ward Philo der Vater der Kirchenväter. Das Christenthum trat seine Erbschaft an und baute aus seinen Gedankensteinen das Glaubenssystem der Kirche.

Hat die Kirche die Versöhnung von Griechenthum und Judenthum, von Religion und Philosophie zu Stande gebracht? Nein. Die Auferstehung des klassischen sowie des hebräischen Alterthums mit dem Zeitalter der Reformation sprengte die niedrigen Kerkermauern auseinander. Die Einheit ist noch heutigen Tages nicht zu Stande gekommen und wird sobald noch nicht kommen. Erst muss das reine, volle Menschenthum in seiner ganzen Höhe und Tiefe erfasst, mit all seinen Problemen und Idealen verwirklicht sein, dann erst werden Philosophie und Religion, Wissen und Ahnen als Himmelslichter, ohne, wie Sonne und Mond, einander zu fliehen, herrschen, dann erst werden Geist und Gemüth wie der Morgen- und der Abendstern als Eine Gottesleuchte aus der Höhe strahlen. Erde und Himmel, Endlichkeit und Unendlichkeit werden sich miteinander vermählen, der Geist Gottes und der Menscheng Geist im Reich des Guten und Wahren ihre Einigung und Versöhnung feiern.

MAIMONIDES AND RASHI*

CENTENNIALS, such as our age is especially fond of, are not merely tributes of gratitude to the great men of the past; they serve as wholesome incentives and inspirations to our own lives. The ideas and ideals that moved the great master-builders of former centuries are brought home to us with reinvigorating and energizing force, to imbue our souls with higher aims and views. The year 5665 (or 1904-5) commemorates the centennial of the two greatest masters the Jewish middle ages produced: of Maimonides and Rashi. On the 20th of Tebet (December 28, 1904) it was 700 years since Moses Ben Maimon died, of all the scholars and sages Judaism possessed the most versatile and illustrious. On the 29th of Tammuz (August 1, 1905) it was 800 years that R. Solomon b. Isaac of Troyes, the great Bible and Talmud Commentator, known throughout Jewry by the name of Rashi, finished his earthly career. Widely different as these two men were in aim and character, in their education and range of thought, they together have trained and fashioned the minds, the thinking and the studies of the Jews during the ages as no others did; hence their names as teachers outshine those of all other rabbis.

To begin with Maimonides: While living a century after Rashi, he belongs to that brilliant epoch of Judeo-Arabic culture which, extending from the tenth to the fourteenth century, lent to Judaism a broadness of view and a world-shaping influence such as it did not possess since the days of Hellenism, Maimonides himself forming the culmination point, the ripest fruit and the highest type of that intellectual mastery which left the imprint of the Jewish mind upon all branches of learning, the Law and theology, science and philosophy.

Legend which delights in the miraculous, represents young Moses as a very dull boy who lacked all interest in learning, and being the only child of his father by his first wife, a

butcher's daughter, was nicknamed the butcher's son, until one day in shame and sorrow he fled to the schoolhouse of Joseph Ibn Megash in the city of Lucena, whence after years of painstaking study he returned a scholar and preacher, the admiration and pride of his father and brothers. In reality he was the descendant of a long line of eminent Talmudic scholars who traced their pedigree back to the house of Hillel. Born in Cordova, the Athens of the Moors, on the 13th of Nissan, 1135, he displayed his hereditary genius in early youth. His own father Maimon, a Dayyan (Judge) in possession also of mathematical and astronomical knowledge, gave him his Talmudical as well as scientific training; and such was the spirit then prevalent that young Moses also sat at the feet of Moslem scholars to study natural science, philosophy and medicine.

Under the sway of liberal and enlightening Islam the Jews imbibed those large views which enabled them to apply new scientific methods and principles to the study of the Jewish Law and literature; their scholars became broadminded thinkers. It was the invigorating breeze of intellectuality and research that first came over the Eastern and then the Western world under the banner of the Koran and stirred also the stagnant forces of Talmudic Judaism to a new life. Samuel ben Hofni and Saadia Gaon were the first to claim for reason the power and authority to interpret the letter of the Law, thereby inaugurating in the 10th century that intellectual movement which reached its most powerful exponent in Maimonides:

There is something providential in the life of our Moses. His Pharoah appeared after he had imbibed the broad culture that reigned in his paternal house and in his native city. In his 13th year the fanatical dynasty of the Almohades came to power, and left to the Jews the choice only between the acceptance of the Islamic faith and death. Old Maimon with his family fled first to Almeria, another Spanish town, and then to Fez in Africa, but the spirit of persecution raged even there. Many Jews, to save their lives, resorted to a formal profession of Mohammedanism, and young Maimonides, twenty-five years old, following the example of his father, had the courage to defend these

against the charge of apostasy, insisting that they had not given up one iota of their belief in the One God of Israel, although they failed in not exhibiting the heroic spirit of the martyr; but at the same time he reclaimed them for Judaism, inspiring them with new enthusiasm for their ancient inheritance. He, with his whole paternal household, remained in hiding, and finally in 1165 after so many years of affliction and want, embarked for Palestine and landed in Cairo in Egypt.

The death of his father was soon followed by a greater loss: his brother David, a dealer in jewels, died in mid-ocean, and through this he lost his own fortune and his means of support. He began a new career as practising physician, while at the same time he discharged the office of rabbi of Cairo without any remuneration. In fact, he declared it to be a great wrong to accept compensation as rabbi and teacher of the Law. Meanwhile his authority and his fame, both as rabbi and as physician became world-wide; he was physician of the Sultan Saladin, and his medical writings are almost as numerous as his Rabbinical works. Richard I of England, the Lion-Hearted, wished to engage him as his physician.

Now, in order to point out the genuine power and genius of Maimonides, attention must be called to the following characteristics of his: More than that of any other Jewish writer before or after him, his was a systematic and logical mind, and nothing appealed to him that was without the divine stamp of reason. To him Moses and Aristotle were the world's great teachers. To harmonize the two, the Law of the one and the philosophy of the other, was the great effort of his life, since truth is the aim and end of both. Truth, indeed, was the great passion of his soul. In it he saw the remedy against all ills of existence, physical or spiritual. To combat error born of ignorance and all mysticism which obscure the light of reason is the object of all his writings. Having mastered all the branches of knowledge within his reach, whether in Hebrew or Arabic, he, with his penetrating intellect and clearness of method, succeeded in creating order and system where there seemed but chaos and confusion. There is scarcely a literature in

the world which so lacks method and system as does the Talmud, this labyrinth of Jewish learning in which one controversy leads to another and no discussion to a real solution. Maimonides when a young man of twenty-five began, and when thirty-five, finished a Commentary on the Mishnah which, as the Arabic title *Luminary* suggests, at once elucidated the principles underlying each of the Rabbinical laws and treatises as well as their inner connection and relation. Written in Arabic, it was soon translated into Hebrew, and it became an almost indispensable guide for the student, each part showing the hand of a great master.

Grander still is the Compendium of the Talmud, called by him *Mishneh Torah*, Digest of the Law, better known as the *Yad a-Hazakah* because it consists of fourteen sections—a work so colossal and unique that only an architectonic mind of the highest order could create it. By it he attempted to bring the vast matter of Rabbinical legislation, discussion and controversy into perfect system and at the same time do away with the mysticism and superstition that found utterance on many pages of the Talmud. Finding that too little stress was laid by the Rabbinical Codes on the essentials of religion, on theology and ethics, he mapped out an entirely new system of the Law in which each side of life was to be accorded its proper place and none to be ignored. It was the first and only work of its kind, the *Summa Theologia* of Judaism written in classical Hebrew, in lucid, concise and impressive style. It was the work of ten years of labor—from 1170 to 1180—but it is the product of a legal genius such as Judaism never saw again, and an attempt so bold that it inspired its friends with a veneration which amounted to worship, and its foes with a feeling of awe that bordered on fear and hatred. Was he to be another legislator like Moses ben Amram? Where were his credentials? Would he dare settle all Talmudic controversies and thereby prevent people from studying the Talmud itself? Notwithstanding all the vehement attacks he met with, he was regarded by all his contemporaries as the greatest Rabbinical authority of the age and his decision was asked for in matters of the Law.

But the greatest influence he wielded on Judaism lay in another direction. He achieved what all the other rabbis had neglected to do. While building from the Talmudic material a compact Code of Laws such as was unknown before, he realized that Judaism was more than a system of Law; that it was above all a system of knowledge and thought and a system of truth. For this reason he embodied in his Mishnah Commentary to *Sanhedrin X*, a Jewish Creed formulated in 13 articles, which have since found a place in the liturgy of the Synagogue, and a system of Jewish Ethics in his Commentary to *Abot*. Still, neither his theological nor his ethical system is genuinely Jewish in conception and formulation. Maimonides, like every Moslem philosopher of the liberal school, was an Aristotelian rationalist for whom God is the absolute Intellect and for whom Revelation and Prophecy, Providence and Immortality are not matters of faith, but matters of the intellect. He had no regard for, nor any appreciation of, the mystic and emotional side of faith. Revelation and reason, religion and science are to him one and the same truth. Prophet and philosopher, Moses and Aristotle must be of one accord. The 'I Am Who I Am' of Moses and the Prime Mover of Aristotle are the same. All the qualities ascribed to God in the Bible are but human forms of speech. Only the attribute of Creator he allows to God, and to Moses he accords the highest degree of prophetic vision. The law in its entirety has but one purpose: to improve the physical and social condition of man until he is able to obtain the highest knowledge of God and thus reach the highest perfection. This is the content of the philosophical work which he wrote at the end of his life, the *Moreh Nebukim* (the 'Guide of the Perplexed'). It was a declaration of war against the Cabbala and all mystic belief, a challenge to all men of child-like faith, the boldest system of rationalism ever produced by a Jewish teacher. It provoked both admiration and consternation. It was hailed as a source of light by the rationalists; it was denounced as dangerous heresy by the traditionalists and Cabbalists. When the great master died in his 70th year, 1204, there were ardent Maimunists here and fanatical Anti-Maimunists there, the

bitter warfare between the parties lasting for generations. There were many who vigorously took issue with the blind worshipers of the great personality, about whom it was said: "From Moses to Moses there was none like Moses." Moses ben Maimon undertook the liberation of Judaism from the thralldom of a blind letter-worship and deeply rooted superstition by a forceful appeal to reason. He promoted the spirit of research in Judaism like no other. Yet his very bold and one-sided intellectualism gave rise to a mighty reaction, and the rationalistic movement was soon followed by a tide of mysticism and superstition under the banner of the Cabbala which for centuries obscured the pure light of reason.

Maimonides' Guide, written in Arabic and twice translated into Hebrew and later also into Latin, fructified and liberated also the leading minds of the Church. Albertus Magnus and Thomas of Aquinas copied whole chapters from his *Moreh*, Spinoza and Mendelssohn received their best from him, and so all the thinkers of Christendom were indebted to him. One of the greatest thinkers of all times, he also shows great limitations. An interesting legend relates that his fame as a physician had aroused the jealousy of his colleagues and they conspired against him, accusing him of a plot against the Sultan's life. He was condemned to death, but allowed to choose his mode of execution. Having initiated his pupils into the secrets of anatomy known to no others, he decided to have all the arteries of his body cut open, feeling certain that one artery of the heart containing the life-blood of man would not be touched because unknown to the other physicians. And so it was. The secret chamber of the heart remained intact, Maimonides was saved. The vital point of religion is the heart, not the head. Maimonides accomplished great things for the promotion of liberal thought, but proud reason fails to solve the real problems of life. God dwells with the humble and contrite of heart.

A striking contrast to the great Spanish-Arabic rationalist and legalist or codifier is R M B M (Rambam) the other great medieval teacher whose works are as unexcelled as they are indispensable to the Jewish student to this very

day, *Rashi*, the Frenchman. He is as simple and humble in character and activity as the other is proud and aristocratic. Maimonides cares little for the many, being concerned only, as he says, with the mental rest and peace of the few elect 'one in 500,000.' Rashi, on the contrary, has only the intellectual needs of the average student of the Torah, of Bible and Talmud, in view, and thus becomes the chief promoter of learning, the founder of Rabbinical schools such as the world had not seen since the days of Rab and Samuel in Babylonia. He was no philosopher nor theologian, no man of broad culture nor profound scientific training, such as Spain produced. The Jews of Northern France and Germany were all plain people, many of them prosperous as farmers and winegrowers as well as merchants; but for the ignorant clergy they were on good terms with their Christian neighbors, and up to the time of the Crusades in favor with the ruling classes. As the Church remained uninfluenced by the fertilizing streams of Moorish culture, so the Synagogue remained narrow, the studies confined to Talmudic literature. Italy produced Talmudic scholars in the VIII. and IX. centuries. In Mayence R. Gershom b. Jehuda, called the Light of the Exile, was the founder of a great school of Talmudists in the middle of the IX. century; his pupils there and in Worms and Speier became the teachers of Rashi. There is a Rabbinical saying: "Never does one sun go down on the firmament of Judaism but another arises to shine in its stead: When R. Akiba died, Judah ha Nasi was born." So it may be said of the age of Rashi.

In the same year in which the greatest teacher of Germany in the person of R. Gershom b. Jehuda, died, 1040; Solomon b. Isaac was born in Troyes, a commercial city of the Champagne. His father and uncle were Talmudists. Like all popular heroes, Rashi's life is embellished by legend. His father possessed a precious stone the Church wished to buy for a Madonna statue, so runs a tale. Rather than sell it for such a purpose he would cast it into the sea, though it was all he possessed of worldly goods; whereupon a heavenly voice announced to him that he would soon possess a far more precious jewel in a son to be born

to him. In the city of Worms is also shown a notch in the wall, said to have been formed when his mother, carrying the precious life under her heart, came near being crushed to death by a passing wagon. Also the chair is shown which is said to have been occupied by Rashi as President of the Yeshibah there. He is also described as a great traveler, who traversed the world spreading his wisdom and found his companion in Gan Eden in Barcelona; also as a man of prophetic vision who predicted to Godfrey of Bouillion, the head of the Crusaders and King of Jerusalem, his fate at the risk of his own life. None of these legends contains a kernel of truth. Rashi was a typical Talmud student. He left his native town to study in Worms under Jacob b. Yakar and Isaac b. Eliezer, the disciples of Rabbenu Gershom, and then in Mayence under Isaac b. Yehdua, another disciple of Rabbi Gershom; but soon his teachers discovered that the pupil had outstripped his masters in erudition, in profundity and clearness of thought.

Endowed with a keen, observing and critical mind, he made it the great object of his life to obtain a clear understanding of the vast volumes of the Talmud in all its detail, to sift the various meanings given by the different schools and teachers to every word and phraseology and so arrive at the best possible explanation of the whole subject matter and every expression used throughout this gigantic work. It was an undertaking which required a master-mind with all the intricacies of Talmudic lore, the wit of the Agadah and the controversies of the Halakah, and at the same time a patient toiler in the field of hermeneutics, of lexicography and archaeology. The demand was felt long before his time, and many attempts had been made by leading scholars in one direction or the other to supply the need. Rashi learned from all, while conceiving the plan of embodying the best of all traditional explanations in his own teachings after carefully weighing each opinion of his masters and predecessors. Thus he became the Commentator par excellence. But he was not satisfied with simply finding the meaning of the terminology and phraseology of the difficult pages of the Talmud, a work in which Hebrew and Aramaic, Greek, Persian and Roman

words and ideas confront the reader everywhere and about which little agreement and discernment was found among the rabbis and writers. The text of the Talmud also offered insurmountable difficulties, as the various copies presented various readings, and Rashi endeavored by comparison to obtain the best possible version. For this reason he traveled from one school-house to another within his country, copying manuscripts and comparing them as well as he could. And he was a married man; he had married quite young and became the father of three daughters, each of whom became the wife of a great Talmudist and the mother of still greater Talmudical scholars. You see then there is something providential also in this great life. He had a vineyard which supported his family, while he underwent privation and distress during his years of study.

When twenty-four years old he returned to his native city and devoted his whole life to the task of teaching and writing his Commentary, first on the Talmud and later on, also on the Bible. His fame attracted disciples from all parts of the land, and his simple and sound mode of studying and explaining the Talmud soon effected a revival and a rejuvenation of Rabbinical learning throughout the world. Clear-headed and free from mysticism, he exerted a healthy influence upon the Jews of Germany and France, and his commentary, written in a lucid, concise and pregnant style, did more than any other branch of Jewish literature to foster the common sense and soberly rational conception of Judaism. It has been wittily said that every drop of ink was worth a ducat to Rashi, so sparing was he in the use of words. Indeed, Rashi's commentary soon became the indispensable companion of the Talmud student, the compass by the aid of which also the inexperienced found his way on the vast sea of Talmudic lore. In small letters it was copied by the disciples on the margin of the Gemorah, and thus it appeared in the printed copies of the Talmud ever since; hence the name 'Rashi script.' Thus Rashi and his school, of which his own grandsons were the most prominent ones, inaugurated a new epoch in Rabbinical literature.

Also as Bible commentator Rashi displayed great wisdom

and tact. Between the Rabbinical or traditional interpretation which does not stand the test of scientific investigation and the literal exegesis, such as is demanded by grammar and context, he left the choice to the reader, placing both alongside of each other, thus facilitating and encouraging both methods, though his preference for the scientific method became more pronounced as he advanced in years. He certainly showed by way of contrast the difference between the simple meaning of the text and the complicated and twisted sense of the traditional interpretation, and thus opened the eyes of the Bible reader to rational methods and views. And what he thus began, his grandson, Samuel b. Meir, and others of his school, the so-called French school, carried out more systematically. In this way Rashi unconsciously became a far greater liberator of the Jewish mind than even Maimonides and his school. These by their allegories or symbolism did practically the same all the mystics did; they forced a certain meaning upon the letter of Scripture without any inner justification; Rashi, like some of the Spanish commentators, endeavored to make Scripture convey its own meaning as intended by the human writer and thus forced it from the shackles of tradition, dogma or otherwise. Whatever afterwards mystics did to invent or entangle the text with Cabbalistic lore, Rashi kept the average Jewish mind sober and rational. Moreover, Rashi's Bible Commentary exerted no small influence upon the Reformation, since it was chiefly owing to Rashi that Christian scholars emancipated themselves from the authority of the Church in rendering the Bible the great common sense book of humanity. The saying was: "Had not Nicolaus Lyra played the lute, or lyre, Luther would not have danced." De Lyra's commentary to the Bible opened the eyes of Luther to its sober common sense meaning, yet Nicolaus de Lyra, himself of France, took his explanations all from Rashi.

In order to make his explanations of difficult and rare Talmudic terms clear to everybody he often accompanied them by apt illustrations from daily life, and made them specially interesting by adding the French terminology which has become very valuable for the student of ancient French to-day.

The personal qualities of Rashi were those of the typical Jewish scholar and sage. He was mild and tolerant like Hillel even in a time when the fanaticism and intolerance of the Church spared not his own family,—his grandson.

R. Tam died together with many of his pupils, the martyr's death—he was the model of a Jewish teacher, a man of spotless integrity and unselfish devotion to the Torah. Leroy Beaulieu makes a fine observation, saying the Beau-ideal of the Church is the saint, that of the Synagogue is the sage. As a rule, however, the Jewish sage was also a true saint, if perfect disregard of self and love for humanity constitute the title of such a one. And it is here too that Rashi carries the palm of victory over the far more learned Maimonides: Maimonides, to whom all the treasures of knowledge seemed accessible as to Moses of yore, often overawes us by his intolerance toward unbelievers, Rashi charms us by his sincerity and leniency and love also for the transgressor, the apostate who repented. He has a place in the heart of the Jew as only few in history have; like Moshe Rabbenu, he is still the teacher of the millions of Jews, who, whether in hut or palace, study Bible or Talmud. Judaism is built upon the principles of democracy as regards learning. Each Israelite is to study and to teach the Torah. While Maimonides both as a codifier and a philosopher represents the aristocracy of learning, the few who dive deeply into the sea of the Talmud and soar high to the loftiest region of thought, Rashi with his simple unpretentious commentary on Bible and Talmud represents the democracy of the People of the Book for whom the Am-haarez, the Ignoramus was an object of contempt all these centuries past. So let Rambam be for us the guide and the pattern for assimilating the highest culture and blending it with Jewish thought and Jewish spirituality, while Rashi be to us the pattern and the monitor for the maintenance of the Jewish standard of democracy of learning until the time comes when the earth will be filled with the knowledge of God, as the water covers the sea.

MOSES MENDELSSOHN AND MODERN JUDAISM

GERMANY, the mother country of the Reformation, is also the cradle of Reform Judaism; and Moses Mendelssohn was to the latter, if not in all, at least in many respects, what Martin Luther was to the former; so that a fair estimation of Modern Judaism is as impossible, without a full glance at Mendelssohn and his influence over his people, as a knowledge of Protestantism is without a view of Luther's life. Whether the inaugurators of a new era in history are to be regarded as the real originators, or merely the instruments and agents of the startling and progressive ideas they represent, is a question at issue between various schools of historians. The fact is, there is some truth in both views. The great leaders of the race are found to be now stirred by a deep motive and inspiration from within, and then again by an irresistible compulsion from without. Like high mountain peaks, by their very prominence, they catch the first rays of the dawning day to reflect the light as brilliantly as they receive it, awakening the slumbering world through the same voice that roused them. They stand in awe before the divine call they hear, and yet feel too feeble to follow. Had Moses Mendelssohn, at the very outset, realized the great task allotted to him of delivering his people from the bondage of mediæval Egypt, he would certainly, like the son of Amram at the flaming bush, have cast himself down on his face, with the prayer on his quivering lips: "O God, send another in my stead, for I, with my stammering voice and my uncomely figure, am not fit to be Thy messenger!" He was, indeed, not made of that stuff of which heroes, reformers and revolutionaries are usually built. But just on account of his being, like Moses of yore, one of the meekest and humblest of men, he was probably chosen by Divine Providence to become a guide and a redeemer unto his brethren.

It has often enough been said, but nevertheless wrongly: "JUDAISM HAD NO DARK AGES." To be sure, looking back upon the last four centuries, we find the Jewish people

everywhere, except in Holland and the Dutch colonies and some seaports, as a rule, plunged from the heights of knowledge and free research occupied by them when in Spain and Southern France, into a wild sea of mysticism and superstition, which marred their mental and moral welfare, or confined to the narrow citadel of the Talmud, to become entirely estranged from the great affairs of the wide world. Just when the great discoveries of the new world and arts and sciences heralded the approaching morning for Europe, Israel, its watchman in the night, fell asleep, wearied and exhausted at last; and the lamps of knowledge, so long anxiously kept lighted by him, smouldered. Especially in Germany we find the Jews dis severed from all contact with their fellow citizens, in consequence of the incessant tortures and persecutions of the blood-thirsty mob, chiefly since the fourteenth century, when, after the Black Death, terrible wholesale massacres drove them in masses to Poland, to settle there until, in the seventeenth century, an outbreak of Slavonic fanaticism brought them back again. Shut up in their ghettos, without a home and without the enjoyment of any freedom, they were cut off from the refreshing stream of general culture, which, up to the thirteenth century, had enlivened their households with German poetry and song, and even induced many to take a prominent part in German minstrelsy and literary tournaments. *They became living mummies*—pitiable ruins of a glorious past. Their entire intellectual life grew stagnant and stale; their views narrow, and their conduct towards outsiders shy, cautious, and anything but frank and manly. German literature, like no other within Jewish reach, lapsed into neglect and disrepute. Even the use of German letters fell into oblivion. Their language, written only in Hebrew letters, turned into an uncouth jargon—a petrified dialect—rendered unintelligible by a confusion with foreign elements and forms of speech—Hebrew, French, Polish and other words being mixed up with it. Along with this went a barbarous degradation of taste, a lack of external refinement, rendering their habits ever more offensive to foreigners. And this was especially fostered by Polish rabbis, who, engaged as teachers in schools and leaders of congregations, trained the

minds of the young only for the brilliant gymnastics of hair-splitting Talmudical casuistry and sophistry, while imbuing them with a dislike for philosophical and general erudition. Nor did the Judeo-German works of instruction and edification, or entertainment, cultivate among the fair sex anything like a sense for beauty and fine, elegant forms.

To emancipate the Jewish people from this self-imposed exile, and lead them back to the great world around them, was no easy task. Political rulers would not undertake it, as Christian prejudice beheld in the deplorable condition of the Jews an irredeemable curse of God Almighty. Nor would, by mere enlightenment, any Jewish reformer have succeeded in accomplishing it, as his efforts would instantly have been crushed by the storm of opposition he had roused in his own camp. But look, how the bright sun enters as a conqueror into a world enwrapped in night! As a king of beauty, clad in purple, riding on his golden chariot, he draws all beings with winning love to his majestic realm of light, while darkness hastens away in terror. Thus the light of truth enters through the morn-gates of beauty into the human heart. Not as a keen intellect and a great genius, with a sharp unrelenting sword of truth, but as a most beautiful soul, as a sweet and perfect personality, soliciting general admiration by his tenderness and wide sympathies, Mendelssohn became the regenerator of his people.

A boy fourteen years of age, timid and shy, hunch-backed and stuttering, our Moses, the son of a poor Jewish teacher and writer of Hebrew scrolls, by the name of Mendel, in the city of Dessau, stood, one day in the year 1743, at the Rosenthaler gate of Berlin, asking, like all Jewish foreigners, for a permit to enter the city; and, when examined as to his vocation and means of support, he could only stammer forth the words: "Rabbi David Frankel." David Frankel, one of the few liberal-minded rabbis then living, had in the very same year moved from Dessau to Berlin, following a call as rabbi there. When in Dessau he had been the youth's teacher. Admiring his precocious talents and brightness, he not only loved to walk with him on the plains of rabbinical knowledge, then acquired by all Jewish boys, but also allured him to soar up into the lofty regions of philosophy,

following the keen flights of the great Maimonides. He had kindled great zeal and thirst for learning in the lad's breast to induce him to sacrifice many a night's rest to his noble pursuits, whereby he indeed injured his delicate frame, nervous attacks curbing his straight stature. Now he was gladly received by the Berlin rabbi, who obtained for him free lodging in a friend's house; and, in order to support himself, paid him a few pennies per week for copying for him a new Talmud commentary just ready for the press. With this small income, barely sufficient to save him from need and despair, he prepared himself for the rabbinical career. But his mind, craving for knowledge, could not bear the self-reproach of being, like his fellow-students and co-religionists, unable to read a German book. Jewish history and literature condemned such fatal ignorance and barbarity. He seized upon the first German work that came within his sight, bought it, and, like a thief in the night, groped, by dint of deciphering and guessing, into its meaning. It was a book on Protestant theology, which, as he mastered it, opened a new field of speculation before him. Once the progenitor of the Bleichroeder family in Berlin, his fellow-student, to whom he imparted his scanty knowledge of German, fetched him, at his request, a German book; and, being thus met by the superintendent of Jewish relief, was instantly, in spite of Mendelssohn's intercession, compelled to leave the city. Under such difficulties and dangers Mendelssohn got his first glimpse of general culture. Soon afterwards he was so fortunate as to become acquainted with an enlightened Polish rabbi, who, from a Hebrew translation of Euclid, gave him instruction in mathematics, and turned his mind to philosophical studies; then with another Jewish scholar, who taught him the first rudiments of Latin; and finally with Dr. Gumperz, of Berlin, perhaps the first Jew who earned the Doctor's diploma in a German university, who awakened his interest for modern languages and philosophies, and to whose influence it was chiefly due that the rabbinical candidate turned into a devotee of modern literature and philosophy.

After seven years of hard toil and untiring study, Mendelssohn accepted an engagement as teacher in the house of

Mr. Bernard, a Jewish silk manufacturer at Berlin, which after a few years he exchanged for the position of book-keeper in the manufactory, in which he remained for life. In the very same years his fate was sealed by being introduced by Dr. Gumperz to Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, at a game of chess, an old favorite among Jewish thinkers. Lessing loved the Jews, as he did all those proscribed and hunted down by prejudice. Unlike Frederick the Great and the Koenigsberg philosopher Kant, he could not behold in them a nation of tricksters and deceivers, but men as whole-souled and generous as their Christian abusers, whenever they were offered the opportunity to unfold their noble qualities. With this view he had already, in the year 1749, as a lad of twenty years, in anticipation of his great drama—Nathan the Wise—written his little comedy entitled, *The Jews*. Therein a Jew is represented, by his generosity and broad liberality of views, as putting all his prejudiced Christian friends to shame. Here at once Lessing met the Jew of his poetical vision, a real man filled with lofty ideas, the very type of the despised and scoffed-at nation, but with the fire of heaven beaming in the eye and with words of wisdom, sweet like honey, flowing from the trembling tongue. Here was the philosophy of the day, broad yet bombastic, offered with a deep, glowing pathos to touch the springs of the heart, the philosophy of Leibnitz with its central idea of human perfectibility, as widened and flattened by the Wolfian school, presented in words which, when dwelling on human rights, fell like music upon the ear; or, when expressing indignation at human self-degradation, reminded the auditor, like those of Isaiah, of the wild roar of the sea. With the glance of genius, Lessing detected the precious pearl in the unseemly shell. And Mendelssohn, with his tender, sympathetic, nature, could not help admiring the superior qualities of the fulminant thinker whose search after truth was ever quick in dispelling all mists of error on his path. So they clasped each other's hand for immortal friendship, clinging unto each other as the tender ivy does to the strong oak tree, and the robust man to the graceful and delicate woman. Daily they conversed with each other, Lessing suggesting ever new subjects, while controlling the

discussion, and Mendelssohn ever emitting sparks of wit and wisdom from his overflowing heart.

In his retiring modesty good Moses would never have ventured to step before the public as an author but for his friend Lessing. While discussing a work of Shaftesbury, Mendelssohn happened to say: "I could write a book like that myself;" whereupon Lessing replied: "Why, then, write one!" After a while Mendelssohn gave him a manuscript containing "Philosophical Discussions," dwelling on the relations of Leibnitz, the first German philosopher, to Spinoza, the great Jewish thinker of Amsterdam. Lessing kept the manuscript for months, and at last returned it—to Mendelssohn's great surprise—in print. His success encouraged the latter to join Lessing in his endeavor to deepen and purify German life, and literature from French parasitism, which had so long been sapping the old oak tree of all its strength, and to ennoble and beautify the German language, which then appeared to the great Prussian King, according to his own saying, 'good enough for brutes.' In order to render German thought and sentiment again dominant in the land, in place of Voltairian raillery and French frivolity, the pious Jew and the fiery German patriot united in studying the laws of beauty and harmony, the rules of style and fine arts, and in reviewing the literature of the day in æsthetical works and papers. The pupil of the "Juden Schul" became a leading master of æsthetics, and would not shrink even from censuring, of course couched in most reverential and pleasant words, a work of King Frederick himself for his flat denial of the soul's immortality and his French propensities. Of course, flatterers did not fail to accuse the Jew before the King; but Mendelssohn, when summoned before the royal scoffer, humbly said: "A royal author is like a king playing at ninepins, who is always bound to submit to the verdict of the insignificant bowling boy." The proud King, however, never forgave him. For a long time he refused to bestow upon him a certificate of citizenship, in spite of his friend D'Alembert's solicitation; nor would he ever allow Mendelssohn's name to be enlisted among the members of the Royal Academy, as proposed, although he had won the prize in competi-

tion with the great Kant with his academical prize-essay, and already earned a world's reputation by his "Phaedon." This fine dialogue, written in 1767, after the model of Plato, to prove, by modern arguments, borrowed from the Wolfian philosophy, the soul's immortality and the inviolable holiness of human life (emanating from discussions on the subject with his lamented young friend Abbt), was everywhere welcomed like a soothing balm upon the bleeding wounds of the age. It attempted to stem the growing tide of French atheism; which, declaring man to be a mere machine, showed its damaging effect by many suicides then occurring in all circles, and worked like an epidemic upon many a noble youth. Even Frederick the Great was in the habit of carrying poison in his pocket, in order to use it, in case of any failure of his plans. This timely and elegantly written work, translated into many languages, spread the author's fame. From all sides came scholars and princes to see the 'modern Socrates,' and letters, to pay homage to, or to secure advice from the wise Moses of Berlin.

Having thus far, in his shyness, refrained from publicly discussing religious opinions and enlarging on his Jewish persuasion, he was quite unexpectedly challenged by Lavater, an eccentric Swiss clergyman and admirer of his, who, in a translation of a French work on the Proofs of Christianity, dedicated to him, solemnly implored him to either refute the arguments therein presented, or, in case of their approval, to do what prudence, truthfulness and honesty would command him, Socrates-like, to do. The good, peace-loving, soul felt sorely wounded at thus seeing his holiest thoughts dragged upon the dusty arena of public discussions. Still, he had to reply; and he did it with such dignified calmness and touching sweetness, as to render it a triumph of the Jewish cause. In pleasant, and at the same time most impressive words, he declared his life-long conviction to be on the side of his unfortunate co-religionists, to abide by whom he ever felt prompted only by truth, as he conceived it, though wordly prudence might dissuade him. And as to miracles, they could be taken as proofs of any other religion as well as of Christianity. There was but one voice as to who of the two proved to be the superior—

whether the modest Jew, or the obtrusive Christian. In a most interesting private correspondence, dogmatic Christianity was contrasted with cosmopolitan Judaism; the one as laying all stress on beliefs, the other on virtuous deeds. But, as was to be expected, Mendelssohn's much desired privacy was encroached upon by visits and communications from high and low, from literary vagabonds, and from crowned patrons of literature, all of whom were surprised to see the marvelous man, showing so few of those qualities commonly attributed to the Jew, and so many of the accomplished gentleman.

The little skirmish with Lavater, however, was the forerunner of a greater battle, fought by him in common with his friend Lessing in the interest of religious tolerance and enlightenment. The Alsatian Jews being threatened with expatriation in consequence of agitations, partly due to Voltairian malice, had applied to Mendelssohn for a memorial to be presented to the French government in their behalf. And he prevailed upon his friend Dohm, the great Prussian statesman, to write, in 1781, his famous work on *The Civil Amelioration of the Jews*; in which a most excellent and stirring plea was offered, in the name of humanity, of justice and political wisdom, for the emancipation of the sadly oppressed people. But in claiming for them not only all civil rights as members of the state, but also all those ecclesiastical rights exercised by the Christian church within her fold, particularly insisting upon the rights of excommunicating and punishing dissenters, Dohm trespassed upon the sacred principles of liberty and religious tolerance maintained by Mendelssohn. Having induced his younger friend, Dr. Marcus Herz, to translate *Manasseh ben Israel's* long forgotten defense of the Jews, written for Cromwell against the opponents of the admission of the Jews into England, he published it with a preface, in which in most eloquent words he stated his own views in regard to ecclesiastical power. After dwelling on the impossibility of eradicating Christian prejudice which, chameleon-like, only changed its colors during the ages, but ever remained the same, he boldly denies the very right of existence of a church arrogating to herself a privilege of the state, viz.—

the power to punish and to reward. Religion, he says, required no arms; it is all heart and spirit. Its purpose is to elevate and to admonish, particularly the erring and the fallen. Like Solomon's Temple, the house of God must be opened unto all believers or unbelievers. Finally, he appeals to the Jewish rabbis to abolish anathemas and other tokens of intolerance. "Love, in order to be loved!" is his concluding word. Did the departed spirit of Lessing hover over the bereft friend when he thus advocated the rights of humanity? What had become of the Jew who swore by the thunders of smoking Sinai? He was, indeed charged, in an anonymous letter, with having deserted Judaism, as based on the Mosaic legislation, and requested openly and unreservedly to embrace Christianity. Then he rose to his full height, and wrote his master-work—Jerusalem, or Religious Power and Judaism.

As Lessing and Reimarus, his fellow-workers for enlightenment, had drawn a sharp line between Creed and Divine Revelation, Mendelssohn quite as characteristically distinguished between Church and Religion. Religion, he says, must convince and persuade, but not threaten and bribe. Temporal punishments, as usurped by the Church, belong to the State, the power controlling and ruling human actions. Religion, whose province is human sentiment and thought, the springs and motive powers of the heart, ought only to inspire and to instruct, to exhort and to reason. Only by trespassing upon the rights and privileges of humanity, the Church as a religious power can enforce and constrain her rules like the State. The true daughter of God, however, wears no sword, nor does she punish and reward. She is all love and truth. As to Judaism, it is actually a revealed legislation rather than a revealed religion; a theocratic institution, built upon natural religion, common to all men. God did not speak of His relation to man and the world on Sinai, but gave commandments as a Ruler to the Israelitish people He chose as His priest among the nations. All the penalties enacted by the Mosaic legislation are only inflicted on wrong-doers, but not on wrong-thinkers; actual violations of the laws, but not false beliefs, were to be punished. The truths about God and the future

life are everywhere presupposed as the common patrimony of mankind, found by the help of reason, but nowhere enforced as beliefs. The Hebrew does not even possess a word for dogmatical belief or creed; knowledge of God is the aim of Judaism. Maimonides, trying to formulate a Jewish creed in thirteen articles of faith, was opposed by Crescas and Albo, who reduced them to the number of three, such as will ever form the basis of natural religion common to all men. As regards the ceremonial laws of Judaism, they were intended as living symbols and helps to perpetuate these divine truths among the Jews as a nation of priests, without ever leading to misconception and fatal errors, such as were brought about by pictures and visible signs, which had, in the course of time, led other nations to idolatry. And these ceremonies are to serve as a common bond between all the Jews, in spite of all mental reluctance, ever to be kept by every descendant of Jacob, until a new divine revelation, as public and solemn and as clear and definite as the first one on Sinai, will abrogate them.

The book was hailed by Kant the great Koenigsberg thinker, as a gladdening token of a new era of enlightenment, not only for the Jewish, but for the human race. Mirabeau wished to see it translated into every modern language. It was, indeed, the ripest and sweetest fruit of the Wolfian philosophy, combined with some of the best ideas of Spinoza and Maimonides. Of course, it surpassed the comprehension of the Jewish people as a class, and, therefore, created much greater sensation outside of their pale. They only gloried in the credit their admired co-religionist reflected on them. But to bask in the sun of truth, and breathe the invigorating air of freedom, while his brethren groaned under the yoke of abuse and superstition so far beneath him, could anything but gratify the new Moses. Yet he was of too conservative a spirit to indulge in reformatory overthrow of endeared old customs and beliefs. Except, when asked for his opinion on the custom of early burials, he declared the practice a horrid crime; and, save a general remark made by him about abuses, which, like the rust of age, had crept into the Jewish religion, he said and committed nothing to excite the suspicion of the most orthodox. His household

and private life were still regulated after the prevailing custom, and his interest in the affairs of the Jewish congregation was manifested by many literary works he gladly undertook for them. Thus, he composed hymns and sermons for especial occasions, wrote a German compendium of the Jewish civil laws, and formulated a Jewish oath for the Prussian government. All he desired and urged was improvement in taste, refinement in style, and purity in language. With this view in mind, he undertook, in the first instance, for his own two sons, then for his people at large, the translation of the five books of Moses into pure German. He was not in the least prepared for public disapproval, and still less for an anathema from the old-fashioned rabbis, anxious as he was to translate the Biblical text in strict accordance with tradition. Still, though thus received, he persevered in the work, with the assistance of Solomon Dubno, Hartwig Wessely, Herz Homberg, and other learned friends, who furnished the Hebrew commentary, while others lent their influence and substantial support to carry it through. The translation, printed at first in Hebrew letters, like Luther's Bible, effected a perfect revolution in the Jewish camp. It was the death-knell of the barbarous Polish school system. The year 1780 marks a new era in Judaism. His translation of the Psalms and a few other Hebrew songs, a work of fine artistic skill, exerted a decided influence on Christian theologians, particularly on Herder, the regenerator of Biblical knowledge. Mendelssohn intended also to translate the rest of the Bible; but he was urged, by his friendship for Lessing, to build a monument to him, who, in his Nathan the Wise had erected one to him, and did so at the cost of his life. He meant to write Lessing's biography, but was prevented by the charge of Spinozism, made by Jacobi against the latter. Utterly shocked, he published his *Morgenstunden*, an exposition of his philosophical system, with a tribute of honor to Spinoza, and also to Lessing, in whose name he refuted the former's views. God, he most exquisitely remarks, loses nothing of His sublime majesty by our attributing to Him personal care for the smallest of His creatures, or else yon noble French King would have forfeited his royal dignity by

allowing an ambassador to witness his playing hobby-horse with his child. As the rabbis say, God's true greatness consists in His very condescension to the humblest of beings.

Like Moses of old, Mendelssohn wrote the last lines of his book, and another article in defense of Lessing, with tears. It was his end. Still, he was spared the greater grief of seeing the fearful havoc wrought in his own house, and in the circle of his next and dearest friends, by the influence of the very culture and refinement he had so nobly aspired to. His life was a charming May-day, bright and mild, in advance of spring, which is ushered into a world held under winter's frosty reign only amidst the roaring of thunder and flashes of lightning by destructive storms and tempests. His very personality was a promise of the blessed land in store for his people, but he was not to apprehend at what sacrifice it was to be obtained. Showing the opportunities for a Jew, he roused the ambition of his brethren to follow. His Pentateuch translation formed for all the bridge to long neglected general culture. His pupils or apostles, as we may call those who every Sabbath afternoon, used to assemble in his house for philosophical and religious discussions with their master, scattered the seeds of his liberal teachings abroad, continuing, as they intended, his work in papers, through free schools and in Jewish societies, organized for the purpose of enlightenment and the social elevation of the Jews, already during his life and with his assistance. Yet there was something in Mendelssohn that could not be either inherited nor transmitted; and this was the splendid and rare harmony of mind and heart, of the Jew and the man, in which the old and the new were so sweetly blended. Others turned their whole attention to the latter, ousting the former, and thus creating a rupture. Indeed, the storm was already brewing afar during Mendelssohn's later years. He forecast it when regretting that his weakness prevented him from following the all-crushing Kant. This Robespierre of the intellectual world had then already laid his ax to the very foundation of the so-called enlightened philosophy, with its natural religion theory. By his sharp analytical powers, he upset all theology built on the infallibility of human reason, showing all our conceptions and perceptions to be forms

emanating only from our own mental fabric, while the reality of things lies beyond the reach of man. Common sense being thus dethroned, critical and historical research joined the French Revolution in undermining all religious and secular authorities by those very weapons wielded by Reimarus and Lessing, whom their friend Mendelssohn, with his philosophy of human happiness, utterly shrank from following. The world was drifting far away from the old landmarks; could Mendelssohn's followers maintain them? They had already, during his lifetime, pointed to the inconsistencies in his own system, when he insisted on having the old ceremonial laws, although they be dead and no longer intelligible forms, forever preserved as marks of Jewish fellowship in place of the Christian dogmas, whereas he elsewhere denounced religious practices without meaning, as obstacles to true religiousness. They, as cosmopolitans and German citizens, objected to the idea of being obliged to uphold what Mendelssohn termed a theocratical or political institution given to the Jews in Palestine. And this view, bluntly expressed by Solomon Maimon, a characteristic combination of an intellectual giant and a moral wretch, was indeed the signature of the Post-Mendelssohnian age. There, on the one hand, a decrepit world was swept away by the wild storm of the French Revolution; and, on the other, a spring-tide of vigorous new life carried along young Germany, elated by enthusiastic visions and fancies. The liberal Jews of Berlin, Koenigsberg and Vienna, in contrast with the narrow-minded Christian Philistines, following Mendelssohn's example, opened their parlors to the great men of the world, the keen and brilliant representatives of these revolutionizing ideas, and became infatuated with their dazzling modern views—to turn into frivolous French cosmopolitans, or to become eccentric and passionate German adorers of Christian art and literature, nay, of romantic Christian bigotry and licentiousness, as was the sad fate of Mendelssohn's talented daughters and their women friends. Apostasy and wholesale baptism became the ruling fashion. Mendelssohn's children, all but one, embraced Christianity. Consternation and despair befell the enlightened Jewish circles of Berlin so as to induce David Fried-

laender, Mendelssohn's intimate friend and the most generous propagator of his ideas, to offer in their name terms of compromise to official Christianity, which were, however, happily refused. Was Judaism really a mummy, which crumbles into pieces when brought into contact with the fresh air of freedom? Was the life infused into its veins and arteries by the new movement again ebbing away forever, to leave it a corpse? A storm wind from the West came to dispel the oppressive clouds thickening the air. The mighty combat between the French ideas of revolutionary cosmopolitanism and the rising power of Protestant Germany decided first on the battle field of Jena in favor of the one, and finally at Leipzig in favor of the other, exercised a determining influence on the progress of modern Judaism.

While pointing with pride to the noble Mendelssohn, Mirabeau and Abbe Gregoire had succeeded in emancipating the Jews in France; but Napoleon, the step-son of the Republic, turned them also into glowing French patriots. Intending to use them as instruments for his far-reaching plans, probably with especial regard to Palestine, he convoked an assembly of Jewish notables, and after this also a Jewish Synhedrion, in order to be assured of their loyalty and patriotism, rather than of anything else. Ever since then the Jews and Judaism have been recognized and respected in France by the people and the government, without, however, making any great headway in regard to the inner reform or enlightenment except through the influence of imported German ideas. In Germany and the Austrian empire with its surroundings, a reaction in philosophy and literature, as well as in religion and politics set in, checking the broad philanthropic tendencies of the Mendelssohn school by royal edicts; and the Jews, who had so bravely fought on the battlefield against the Frenchmen, looked in vain for an acknowledgment of their rights as citizens, as accorded to their brethren beyond the Rhine. Violent outbursts of fanaticism in German literature, as well as on city streets, reminded the German Jews that they were still regarded as foreigners in the land which Mendelssohn and Lessing had roused from sleep, and in the morning-song of which, as sung by its great poets,

they themselves had so heartily joined. Henceforth the struggle for their social and political emancipation occupied all hearts and minds. Many a noble champion of liberty staggered and stumbled, misled by the most Christian labyrinthic Hegelian philosophy, or from sheer despair. Still, even as deserters of the Jewish flag, many a one, like Heine and Boerne, helped in compelling prejudice to surrender. Brilliant Jewish talents on every field of literature, science and art, in industry and politics, rendered the social recognition of the so long oppressed an irrevocable fact, and the political one, finding in Gabriel Riesser so influential and admirable an advocate, could no longer be withheld.

Of a far slower and more tender growth was their religious reform. Of course, the very watchword 'reform' implied, contrary to the nihilistic tendencies of the age, preservation of Judaism. It desired to inspire the ancient faith with fresh hope, to kindle the holy fire anew on the deserted altar of God, and to infuse a new life into the despondent and torpid hearts. Originating in the philanthropic schools in Cassel, Seezen and Wolfenbuettel, founded by the enthusiastic and generous Israel Jacobson, after the model of the Mendelssohn free schools, it intended only to render instruction more impressive by the introduction of regular Sabbath services, with songs and sermons in the vernacular, and of the rite of confirmation as the solemn close of the school course. The great success Jacobson met with induced him to transfer the reformed service from the school-house to the Synagogue, and to render it more solemn by the stirring peals of the organ; and, in this way, to introduce it in Berlin and in other cities. Of course, many were startled to see the venerable and chaste Jewish matron thus put into the dress and ornament of Christianity, her daughter. She looked rather gay and coquettish. Still it pleased, it edified, and finally won, and saved many of the lost, the wavering and despairing members of modern Israel. But after all, it was not wine, pressed from the sweet grapes of Palestine, but water; no substantial bread, to feed the hungry, but sweetmeats and wafers. Common-place wisdom and shallow morals were offered from pulpit and desk, but Judaism, as a historical religion, was ignored; and still more so in private

life, where a continued, but unavoidable, disregard of the dietary, the purity, and the Sabbath laws inspired the modern Jew with anything but confidence in the endurance of his religion.

In order to rouse a deeper self-consciousness, and thus bring about a better appreciation of the essence, aim and drift of modern Judaism, a revival of Jewish learning and a deeper insight into Jewish history were required. It was in Poland, near the Austrian frontier, that the seeds of the Mendelssohn school at last yielded fine crops. Rapport's and Krochmal's brilliant and suggestive inquiries struck out new paths in the study of Jewish history and rabbinical literature; while in Berlin, the eminent genius of Dr. Zunz by his epoch-making works, cast a flood of unexpected light upon the glorious path of Judaism. A large host of other scholars joined him. Long hidden veins of Jewish thought and poetry were disclosed before amazed eyes. Judaism was filled with pride, beholding the great treasures heaped up in its mines, waiting only for help to dig and bring them to light. So Germany, the workshop of critical and historical research, became the home of Hebrew studies, German literature the storehouse of Jewish learning and Jewish history. But the fact that Judaism was thus found to be, not a ruin, but a healthy and ever fresh growth, ever changing its forms, while maintaining its spirit, no stiffened corpse but a living and progressive power, gave the reform movement a solid basis, a soul, and firm principles. Abraham Geiger started an inner reform of Judaism, rallying under the banner of Progressive-Rabbinism a large number of the prominent Jewish scholars of the age around him, to deepen Jewish knowledge by new inquiries, and, at the same time, apply the result to practical life. Could, indeed, Mendelssohn's view of a stable and immutable Judaism, or the idea advocated by some of his school of a retrogression to Mosaism, be upheld in an age characterized by the spirit of historic critical inquiry; in an age which, ever since Hegel, Schelling and F. A. Wolf, was bent upon dissolving fixed notions and beliefs, like fixed stars, into myths, and showing all history, language, law and religion to be an evolution of the divine mind in man? Rabbinical and Biblical Judaism

was also proved to be in a perpetual process of growth and development. And, from this view, the young and the apparently foreign child, Reform, was, like Moses found in the river Nile, and handed over to its Jewish mother to be nursed. Still, for the sake of gaining freedom for his own theoretical radicalism, Geiger, being afraid of drawing the last consequences, grew more conservative in practice and indefinite in his positive views and ideas, instead of reconciling both, as he had intended. Thus, the way was paved for Dr. Holdheim, as the leader of Radical Reform, in the name of the great Messianic mission of the Jewish people for mankind, to discard all ceremonial laws as obsolete and no longer obligatory for the present age of Jewish naturalization among the various nations. And although history, in the shape of many disappointments and failures, has given its verdict in disfavor of such radical measures, as the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday, and inter-marriage, radical reform succeeded not only in stemming the tide of apostasy and licentiousness, till then prevalent in large cities among the wealthier and more refined classes, but also in stating and defending the positive views and principles of Judaism once for all time. In opposition, however, to the extreme left, occupied also by Dr. Einhorn and Dr. S. Hirsch, a right wing was formed in the rabbinical conferences by Dr. Frankel, the leader of the positive or conservative historical school; while Dr. Philippsohn, the editor of the *Judenthumszeitung*, remained in the center. But the storm of opposition these reformatory movements met with in the orthodox camp roused even there new mental life and energy. Thus modern Judaism, revived all over the world by the labors of modest Moses Mendelssohn, is found today everywhere nobly represented by theological schools, growing in strength, budding and blossoming, and promising golden harvests for the future, to be gathered by the future theological systems. Through self-knowledge to self-respect and self-perpetuation, has become the battle-cry all along the line.

On the virgin soil of America, radical,—which means principled and positive,—Reform Judaism caused a great revival of our cause. Orthodoxy, which draws its strength

from old institutions and venerable authorities, has been, in this young progressive and practical land, gradually melting away as the snow before the approaching summer. Reform tuned the hearts to new strains of devotion, roused fresh interest in, and reflected new credit on, our noble bequest of the ages. It built gorgeous temples everywhere, and rallied the scattered sons of Israel around more elevated standards of humanity, while showing progress and enlightenment inscribed on the glorious banner of Judaism. It was chiefly due to Dr. Einhorn's energy and firmness, to the inspiring power of his words, to the irresistible force of his arguments in his writings, and, above all, to his ingenious model prayer-book, that Jewish reform in America, attempted here and there without clearness of principles, at once assumed an imposing attitude; and, by its impressive and attractive form, became a universal success. But let us not forget, it did not work as a domestic and natural growth, but as a foreign importation; not as a gradual and historical development, but by steam pressure, quickly and often unsparingly. Hence, the common erroneous view of reform as being destructive, negative, and revolutionary. Hence, we find progress and enlightenment hailed and applauded by the Jews in general all the more, if the annihilation of all belief, the eradication of the entire past. Hence, shallow cosmopolitanism and flat morals, built on the drift-sand of French positivism and nihilism, are regarded by the half-enlightened masses as the very pinnacle of modern wisdom and the last goal of Jewish reform. Yet Judaism is not merely a fine basket with fruits, a variety of moral lessons plucked from the tree of life, but the tree itself, planted in a nation's heart as its soil; not merely a fine lake of crystal water, but a perennial fountain, encased in the rock of ages. Like the stars in heaven, it must turn upon its own axis, in order to pursue its course. Being progressive, by its very nature it requires a conservative spirit, not to galvanize dead forms, but to animate the living souls with sincere faith in its great mission and in God, its master, with a desire for self-preservation based on self-consciousness. Atheism and doubt have ever proved in history to be grave-diggers of dying, not builders of rising,

worlds and epochs. In order to strike deep roots into our soil, American Judaism must learn before all self-respect and self-knowledge; it must find susceptible hearts—souls hungry after Jewish knowledge, which the various institutions of learning, established and planned, are destined to spread. In this respect, the Young Men's Hebrew Associations and similar literary societies will, I trust, serve alongside of the congregations as mighty factors in the elevation and healthy progress of Judaism. Their talents and labors will amply help us in preparing substantial and delicious food, derived from the rich store-house of Jewish-German literature for the mind, and in producing fresh and home-spun Jewish poetry and song, to inspire the hearts with love for our great cause. And thus I feel confident, American Judaism, will become one day the commanding leader of modern Judaism, the pioneer of a religion of humanity, preserved and guarded by the Jewish race, to shine with the brightness of reason, and to glow with the holiest fire of aspiration after the ideal of the good, and the true, and the beautiful, as we behold it in a living and personal God.

As to your Association in this city, you need but follow the young, energetic and inspiring leader in your midst, in order to be sure of success in the right direction. As for us all, we shall always look upon Moses Mendelssohn, the pious Jew and the glowing patriot, the regenerator of Judaism, as our model, to combine ardent love for our race with love for our country, zeal for the common cause of humanity with faithfulness to our mission as priests of mankind, unfaltering faith in God with faith in man.

LEOPOLD ZUNZ

VIELEN jüdischen Kanzelrednern ging es wohl gestern wie mir. Schon wollte ich in die heiteren, helleren Saiten greifen, Angesichts des zur Munterkeit und Frohsinn auffordernden Purimfests, da kommt auf den Blitzesflügeln des Telegraphen von Berlin die Kunde: Der König im Reiche jüdischer Gelehrsamkeit, der Schöpfer der modernen jüdischen Wissenschaft, Leopold Zunz, hat in seinem 92. Jahre das Zeitliche gesegnet!" Mit ihm ist wirklich die Krone jüdischen Geisteslebens dem modernen Israel vom Haupte gefallen! Hier ist eine Lichtsäule, eine Sonne am Himmel des Judenthums erloschen! Doch was sage ich—erloschen? Wie von unserem Ahn Abraham der Midrasch erzählt, dass er zeitlebens einen strahlenden Juwel auf der Brust getragen, mit dem er Kranken Genesung und Trauernden Trost zuflösste, und als er starb, da hing er ihn am Firmamente auf, dass alle Welt an seinem Glanz sich erquickte und verjüngte, so steigt die Lichtfülle des Wissens, die Leopold Zunz in sich vereint hat, mit seinem Hinscheiden zu solcher klaren Aetherhöhe empor, dass alle Parteien des Judenthums Zank und Hader, ja Siechthum und Trübsal vergessen und in der gemeinsamen Trauer um ihn sich erheben und neu kräftigen. Nein—ein Leopold Zunz stirbt nicht—der gehört zu den Wenigen, die schon hienieden nicht sterben können, deren Name schon als Zeugniß der Unsterblichkeit des Geistes für alle Zeiten, wie die Sterne am Himmel, fortstrahlt.

Ich weiss recht wohl, Leopold Zunz ist kein volksthümlicher Name von bekanntem Weltruf und Klang. Für Männer der grossen Welt, die sich durch Anhäufung von Reichthum und Macht Einfluss und Bedeutung verschaffen, hat das grosse Volk, hat unsere, nach äusserer Wohlfahrt ringende Zeit ein ganz anderes Verständniß und Interesse als für diese Männer, die in der Abgeschlossenheit ihres Studierzimmers Schätze des Wissens aufspüren und aufspeichern, die über Jahrtausende der Geschichte ungeahntes

neues Licht werfen, und einem Reiche des Geistes angehören, von dem die grosse Menge noch kaum eine Ahnung hat.

Allein um so mehr ist es Pflicht des Kanzelredners, die Aufmerksamkeit des Volkes auf jene stille Grösse, jenen hohen Reichthum und Adel des Geistes hinzulenken und ihm, das Geheimniss in's Ohr zu raunen, dass צדיק יסוד עולם — dass nicht Geld und Glück die Pfeiler der Menschenwelt sind, sondern jene Träger und Verkörperungen des Ideals, das allein die treibende Macht der Geschichte bildet, dass, wie die Alten sagen: שקול משה כנגד כל ישראל "ein einziger Moses an Werth und Bedeutsamkeit sein ganzes Geschlecht aufwiegt!" Und ich darf wohl sagen: Niemals empfand ich so wie gestern, so recht in seiner vollen Tragweite die ganze Wahrheit, die dem rabbinischen Satze zu Grunde liegt: מיתת צדיקים מכפרת "Der Edlen Tod ist eine Sühne für sein Zeitalter!" So lange ein grosser Mann unter uns lebt, macht uns der Besitz desselben stolz aber auch träge, es kommt uns kaum in den Sinn ihm nachzuahmen, von ihm etwas annehmen. Erst wenn er von uns geht, gewahren wir unseren Mangel und Leichtsinn, und der Verlust spornt uns an Alles zu thun, um ihn, wenn nicht zu ersetzen, was wir nicht können, so doch zum Nacheiferung weckenden Vorbild zu machen, um durch gemeinsame That die Lücke auszufüllen. Und so kann es nicht fehlen, dass wahre Trauer um ihn eine Besserung und Hebung der Zustände veranlasst.

In diesem Sinne lasset mich heut von Leopold Zunz reden, und getrost kann ich an seinen jüdischen Namen anknüpfen: Jomtof Lipman Zunz. Jomtof Lipman ward am 10. August nach jüdischem Datum am Chamischa Asar be ab 1794 in Detmold, geboren und da ihm schon im 9. Jahre der Vater in Hamburg starb, kam er nach Wolfenbüttel, wo in der Samson'schen Schule, unter dem Director Ehrenberg, dem er in einer Gedächtnissrede ein herrliches Denkmal selbst gesetzt, den Grund zu seinem umfassenden Wissen gelegt wurde.

Der 15. Ab ward als ein "guter Tag"—Jomtof—in Israel gefeiert—der Tag, an dem Zunz das Licht der Welt erblickte, ward gewiss ein Jomtof, ein Tag des Guten für die jüdische Welt! Und, wie es von Moses heisst, dass bei seinem Eintritt in's Leben Alles von Licht wiederstrahlte,

וְהָרָא כִּי טוֹב הוּא—dass die glückliche Mutter in der Nacht allgemeiner Bedrängniss fühlte, dass ein neuer Tag für das geknechtete Israel anbrechen müsse, so ging dem modernen Judenthum, das nach dem Hingang Mendelssohn's in einer gar trüben chaotischen Mischung von Licht und Finsterniss sich befand, mit Zunz ein weithin leuchtender guter Stern auf. Und Gott sah, dass das Licht gut sei כִּי טוֹב הוּא. Jedoch weil die Lüge nur allmählig überwunden werden, das Licht über die Finsterniss nur langsam den Sieg erringen kann, darum stellte Gott in den edlen Trägern des Menschheitsideals des Wahren und Guten Herolde des Sieges des Lichts für alle Zukunft auf לְצַדִּיקִים לְעַתִּיד וְנָטַל אֶת הָאוֹר וְנָמוּ לְצַדִּיקִים לעתיד! Nun ja כִּי טוֹב הוּא—In Zunz ist uns ein solcher Sieges-Herold geworden, und statt zu trauern, dass wir ihn verloren, lasset uns mit den Worten der Purim-Megillah seine Laufbahn kennzeichnen: Durch Zunz ist den Juden Licht, Wonne und Ehre zu Theil geworden.

Das Leben von Zunz bietet an sich eigentlich gar nichts Hervorstehendes oder Interessantes: Wenn ich mittheile, dass er 1820 Prediger an einer Berliner Gemeinde, 1825 Schuldirektor daselbst, 1835 auf kurze Zeit in Prag Prediger war und 1840 Direktor eines Lehrerseminars wurde, mit dessen Auflösung 1850 er sich in's Privatleben zurückzog, so habe ich den ganzen Kreis seiner öffentlichen Wirksamkeit fast umschrieben; höchstens könnte ich noch hinzufügen, dass er in den hochgehenden Wogen der revolutionären Bewegungen als witziger Volksredner in Berlin beliebt war—das ist Alles.—Seine Schriften aber waren Thaten von unberechenbarer Bedeutung. Er hat das geistige Judenthum von der Finsterniss an's Licht, vom dumpfen Moder des Grabgewölbes in die frische heitere Luft der Erkenntniss und der lebendigen Forschung, aus der Schmach und Selbsterniedrigung zur Würde und Ehre und zum Selbstrespect emporgehoben. Mendelssohn hat die Juden aus dem Ghetto in die Freiheit geführt, Zunz das Judenthum.

Licht ist das Element des Lebens. Die Finsterniss thut unserem Geiste weh. Dem Kinde wird es Angst in der dunklen Kammer, und auch die Pflanze gedeiht nicht im Finsternen. Das Mittelalter ward eine egyptische Finsterniss, und Juden wie Judenthum wurden am längsten darin

festgebannt. Man sagt öfters, wir hatten kein Mittelalter und keine Finsterniss gehabt. Das ist widersinniges, eitles Gerede. Eine so gänzliche Unwissenheit wie im christlichen Europa, herrschte allerdings bei den Juden nicht. **אורה ונורה**. Die Thora ward zum Licht, das in Hütte wie Palast Strahlen verbreitete von den Zeiten des Josephus bis in unsere. Aber es war doch gar oft nur ein schwaches Nachtlichtlein. Wohl leuchteten Israel in Spanien, Afrika und Italien sonnenhelle Geister wie Maimonides und Gersonides, Ibn Ezra, Donolo, Albo und de Rossi. Allein eben dass auf solche Tageshelle der freien Forschung eine solche Finsterniss des Aberglaubens über Israel hereinbrechen konnte, dass die tollsten Dinge von den Juden geglaubt und als heilig und göttlich angenommen wurden, dass selbst die Namen und das Werk jener grossen Männer in totale Vergessenheit geriethen und die kabbalistischen Schriften von Betrügnern und Schwindlern Jahrhunderte lang die Geister in Bann halten konnten—das beweist doch, das Irrlichter für Licht gehalten wurde und von Wissen und Erkenntniss seiner eigenen Geschichte lange Zeit beim jüdischen Volk keine Rede war.

Verschrobene, rohe und unwissende Talmudlehrer aus Polen behaupteten Jahrhunderte lang die geistige Führerschaft in Deutschland, und die wahren ewig erquickenden Brunnen der jüdischen Religion waren verstopft mit dem Schutt der Jahrhunderte. Der Talmud und die ganze rabbinische Literatur war zu einer Seiltänzerschule des Witzes geworden, in der Jeder tolle Geistessprünge machen lernte, um dem lieben Gott im Himmel zu gefallen, zum Labyrinth, darin man tausenderlei Stricke um seinen gesunden Verstand herumbinden musste, um sich nicht zu verlieren. Das Judenthum schien ein undurchdringlicher Wald, in dem kein Weg und kein Steg zu finden, eine unabsehbare Wildniss, wo kein frisches Wasserlein fliesst und kein liebliches Blümlein spriesst—es sei denn im gemüthlichen Familienleben—wo das Herz treu weinen und lachen, singen und seufzen lernte.

Da kam Mendelssohn und blendete ordentlich alle seine Glaubensgenossen. Er hatte Bildung und Kenntniss, Philosophie und die herrliche Gabe der feinen Redekunst sich

draussen in der nichtjüdischen Welt ordentlich verstohlen angeeignet. Er war doch Jude geblieben, treuer, eifriger Verfechter des Judenthums, aber die Bausteine seines Judenthums waren aus der modernen Philosophie zusammengetragen, nicht aus dem Judenthum. Seine Erscheinung hatte erst recht grelles Licht auf das alte Judenthum und auf seine Irrgänge geworfen. Er hatte eine Kluft geschaffen, in die Tausende von Juden fielen, um—nicht mehr als Juden sich zu fühlen. Man sah blos Finsterniss, empfand blos Schmerz und schämte sich seines Judenthums und kehrte ihm den Rücken. So sah es in den ersten 20 Jahren dieses Jahrhunderts aus—bis dass Zunz kam.

und mit dem Genius göttlicher Inspiration hinab stieg in den dunklen Schacht der Vergangenheit. Er schuf sich Bahn und Steg, verfolgte die Spuren der verschiedenen Gold- und Silberadern und brachte wunderbare Proben, ungekannte Edelmetalle an's Licht und legte so Schätze blos, an deren Aufgrabung die gelehrte Forschung noch lange zu arbeiten haben wird, er entdeckte ganze Kreise neuer Namen ungeahnter Sterne erster Grösse am Himmel der jüdischen Geschichte, und sein grossartiges Schaffen feuerte allenthalben eine immer wachsende Zahl von Genossen und Schülern zur thätigen Mitarbeit auf dem so lange brach gelegenen Felde an.

So legte er den Grund zu einem Bau, an dessen Aufrichtung und Vollendung die Gelehrten vieler Jahrhunderte noch zu thun haben werden. Schon im Jahre 1818, ein Jahr vor dem Hep! Hep!-Jahre, suchte er in einer kleinen Skizze, "Etwas zur rabbinischen Literatur" zu zeigen, das längs des ganzen Gebietes des jüdischen Schriftenthums ungehobene Schätze liegen, die des kundigen Bergmanns harren. Dann ging er 1823 in Verbindung mit dem berühmten, später getauften Rechtslehrer Gans, mit Lazarus Bendavid, Immanuel Wohlwill, Moser u. A., an's Werk, durch Herausgabe einer "Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums" das jüdische Wissen mit der umfassenden Strömung allgemeinen Wissens in enge Verbindung zu bringen, jüdisches Leben im Zusammenhang mit dem Völkerleben aufzuzeigen und vorzuführen. Staunenswerther Bienenfleiss und schärfste Combinationskraft kennzeichnen die Zunz'schen Arbeiten

(über Raschi u. A.) als Meisterwerke ohne Gleichen. Von wahrhaft epochemachender Wirkung aber war sein klassisches Werk: Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (1832), an das sich später sein unvollendet gebliebenes: Zur Geschichte und Literatur I (1845) und seine "Synagogale Poesie" (1855), mit den daran sich knüpfenden Ritus (1859), und Literaturgeschichte (1865), anschlossen, von den zahlreichen kleineren Schriften und Artikeln in Zeitschriften, namentlich der Geiger'schen, nicht zu reden. Hervorgegangen war jenes einzigartige Werk: Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge aus dem Bestreben, dem preussischen Verbot der Predigt und jedes deutschen Klanges in der Synagoge gegenüber, den Beweis zu erbringen, dass das Judenthum von jeher innigen Antheil am Völkerleben rings um es herum genommen, dass es daraus seine gesunden Kräfte und Säfte gezogen und, wo ihm Licht und Luft gegönnt war, auch geblüht und geknospet, und im Drucke noch das liebegeordnete Vaterländische festgehalten und entfaltet hätte, mit einem Worte, dass es nicht zur Verdampfung und Versumpfung berufen wäre, sondern zum frischen Leben und Wachsen im Weltgange. Aber die wissenschaftliche Anregung, die hier allen jüdischen Forschern und Gelehrten geboten ward, in dem auch das kleinste unscheinbarste Körnlein zum meisterhaften Aufbau des Ganzen benutzt worden war, wirkte, wie Geiger sagt, "wie ein allbefruchtender Bergstrom." Wie der grosse Kreis von Geschichtsforschern und mit ihnen die gebildete Welt mit dankbarer Verehrung zu dem greisen Leopold Ranke als Bahnbrecher, oder wie die klassische Wissenschaft in P. A. Boeckh, die germanische an Jacob Grimm oder die Geographie an Carl Ritter, die literarische Kritik an F. A. Wolf ihren Schöpfer gefunden, so erblickt, wie Doktor Stern in seinen Vorlesungen richtig bemerkt, das geschichtliche Judenthum in dem nun verewigten Zunz seinen Neuentdecker. An diesen und anderen Meistern hatte sich Zunz, der erste Jude, der nach absolvirtem Gymnasialstudien die Universität betreten, gebildet, um ihre Methode und ihre feine Kunst auf das Aschenbrödel der Wissenschaften, das Judenthum, anzuwenden. Er hatte dabei das eine Ziel im Auge: "Aus der Gleichstellung der Wissenschaft des

Judenthums muss die Gleichstellung des Judenthums hervorgehen."

Und wie Licht, so ward Leopold Zunz auch ein Freudenquell der Juden: Er schrieb und forschte nicht blos mit seinem Geiste, sondern auch mit seinem Herzen. Er hat in gährender, wirrer Zeit, zur Bewunderung eines Heinrich Heine, all den Versuchungen Widerstand geleistet, denen seine Jugend- und Studiengenossen zum Opfer fielen. Während Männer wie Gans feige fahnenflüchtig wurden und verzweifelnd sich dem Christenthum in die Arme warfen, weil die erhoffte Wiederbelebung des jüdischen Geistes, die sittliche Erneuerung der jüdischen Intelligenz und Opulenz ausblieb, blieb Zunz der Fahne Israel's treu und ward Bannerträger seines Geistes. Wenn es Täuschung ist, schrieb er, nach dem Zusammenbruch des Vereins für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums, an eine Juden-Reformation zu glauben, so lebt doch die Wissenschaft des Judenthums. "Sie lebt, auch wenn Jahrhunderte lang sich kein Finger für sie regte." Ihr widmete er sein Leben, und mit seltener Charakterfestigkeit und Biederkeit blieb er, wie Heine sagt, "in unerschütterlichster Unwandelbarkeit in einer schwankenden Uebergangsperiode trotz seiner Skepsis dem selbstgegebenen Worte, der grossmüthigen Grille seiner Seele treu", und "Mann der Rede und der That, hat er geschafft und gewirkt, wo Andere träumten und muthlos hinsanken."

Allerdings blieb der bittere Stachel des Missmuths und der Verzweiflung an der Erweckung des Judenthums, dieser "Asiaten" oder "Nothchristen," in seiner Seele sitzen, und ohne Glauben an den Fortschritt derselben, versenkte er sich mit immer steigender Melancholie in die Jammerlagen der Vergangenheit. Er schrieb die synagole Poesie der Juden mit seinem Herzblute, und wie er die Seufzer und Klagetöne der mittelalterlich-jüdischen Dichter nachklingen hörte, da ward sein Herz selbst zur Trauerharfe, und seiner Feder entquollen Thränen, dumpfe Klagen und Elegien. Er fühlte es, er schrieb die Tragödie des nationalen Judenthums, und mehr und mehr ward ihm das Judenthum selbst eine Jammergestalt, nicht ein siegender, sondern ein leidender Messias. Wer Daniel Deronda gelesen, erinnert sich wohl des

zum Motto dort gewählten Ausspruches Leopold Zunz's. "Wenn es eine Stufenleiter von Leiden gibt, so hat Israel die höchste Staffel erstiegen. Wenn die Dauer der Schmerzen und die Geduld, mit der sie ertragen werden, adeln, so nehmen es die Juden mit den Hochgeborenen aller Länder auf. Wenn eine Literatur reich genannt wird, die wenige Trauerspiele besitzt, welcher Platz gebührt dann einer Tragödie, die anderthalb Jahrhunderte währt, gedichtet und dargestellt von den Helden selber."—Ja, wie ein Jeremias, weinte der Forscher für sein leidendes Volk, und ach, wie Isaak nach der Legende auf dem Holzstosse, so wurde auch unsrem Zunz vom Thränenstrom der Blick umflort. Er verengte und verlor sich im Mittelalter und vergass die Bedürfnisse der Neuzeit.

Schon im Jahre 1845 geisselt sein Jünger und Freund Geiger den merkbaren Rückschritt des Meisters, der vom klar umherblickenden Geschichtsforscher und Mann der Wahrheit suchenden Wissenschaft zum engherzigen Apologeten des alten Judenthums hinabsinkt. Und in der That zeigt sich hier das Tragische im Wirken des Edlen. Nachdem er in grossartigen Zügen den Entwicklungsgang, den Fortschritt des Judenthums gezeichnet und die Berechtigung der Reform erwiesen hatte, verzagte er zehn Jahre darauf, als der von ihm geweckte Geist Leben entfalten und seine Lichtsaat aufgehen wollte, und versagte zum Aufbau des Reformgebäudes fürs neuentstehende Judenthum seine Mithilfe. Er wurde, ohne es im Leben und eigenen Denken zu sein, in der Theorie conservativ. Ihm hatte sich die Welt im engen Studirzimmer kalt verschlossen, und so verbitterte sich sein Sinn, und er war der Welt gram.

Und doch hatte er dem Judenthum nicht bloss die Leidenskrone des Märtyrers, sondern auch das Prachtdiadem des Geistes-Fürsten aus dunkelster Zeit wieder hervorgesucht, und im Namen des ewigen Rechts gerufen: "Gleiches Recht, gleiche Freiheit fordere ich für meine Brüder, nicht Rechte, nicht Freiheiten!" Wenn preussisch-königliches Despotenwort es den Juden versagte, andere als altbiblische Namen zu führen, so stellte er in seiner Schrift "Namen der Juden" (1837) dieses auf Vorurtheil, Dummheit und Bosheit zugleich gegründete Edikt als

mit der Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Widerspruch stehend bloss. Wenn man den Juden des Christenblutgenusses und des rituellen Mords in der Damascus-Affaire beschuldigte, so griff er, nicht wie Cremieux und Montefiore, zur Macht der Rede, die er nicht wie sie besass, wohl aber zu dem Stahl, den er führte, zur Feder. Kur um er kämpfte gegen Amalek, den Geist des finsternen Hasses, mit der ganzen Kraft seiner grossen Gelehrsamkeit. Und nicht minder als Deutscher, wenn Tyrannei, Pfaffen- und Fürstendespotismus die Freiheit zu knebeln beflissen waren, stritt er mit der Geisel seines Witzes für Freiheit und Recht als echter Jude und Gotteskämpfer. Und wenn die Geschichte einst mit Jubel und Dank der Männer alle gedenkt, die für die Menschheit und der Menschlichkeit heilige Sache mit Mannesmuth und Glaubenstreue gestritten, so darf auch hier Leopold Zunz nicht fehlen.

Am meisten aber betonte er und liess keine Gelegenheit vorübergehen, ohne es bald als geistvoller Kanzelredner bald als klassischer Schriftsteller zu predigen: die Ehre, die Würde, das im Juden zu weckende Selbstbewusstsein. Warum schämen sich noch heute so viele Juden ihres Namens, ihres Glaubens, ihrer Vergangenheit? Aus Unwissenheit. Aus dummer, roher Oberflächlichkeit und Wissensarmuth. Würden die Tausende und Abertausende unserer sogenannten aufgeklärten Genossen die Geschichte und Literatur ihres Volkes, den wunderbaren Gang dieses einzigartigen Volkes durch die Länder und Zeiten wirklich kennen, statt diese zu kennen vermeinen, sie würden den, Namen Juden als höchstes Ehrenzeichen, als grösste Zierde als ihre Prachtkrone stolz tragen, statt ihn überall zu verbergen und zu verleugnen, sie würden durch ihn zum höchsten und reinsten Humanitätswirken vor den Augen aller Welt sich angespornt fühlen, sie würden jedem Haman gegenüber, gleich Mordechai, ihren Charakter als Jude aufrecht stehend, statt sich vor dem Gegner zu ducken, behaupten und so erst sich die Achtung erwerben, die sie jetzt fort und fort in ihrer Beschränktheit verscherzen. Fassen wir in einem einzigen Worte das grossartige Streben, Leisten und Schaffen Leopold (oder Jomtof Lippman) Zunz's zusammen, so können wir von ihm sagen, was die

Esther-Rolle von Mordechai sagt: "Er war einer, der das Gute an seines Volkes Geschichte an's Licht zu fordern bestrebt war und die grossen Ziele des Weltfriedens, der Freiheit, der Einheit und Wohlfahrt der ganzen Menschheit zu verwirklichen suchte. Er war ein ganzer Jude, ein glühender deutscher Patriot, der sogar für die Reinheit der deutschen Sprache wacker kämpfte und ein edler, uneigennütziger, ganz ideal strebender Mensch—ein ganzer Mann. Ganz besonders müssen wir Deutsche es Zunz vielen Dank wissen, dass er den Geist deutscher Wissenschaftlichkeit und Gründlichkeit zum Massstab jüdischer Gelehrsamkeit gemacht, dass er Deutschland auf Jahrhunderte vielleicht zum Mittel—und Brennpunkt jüdischer Forschung erhoben und damit der Reform, dem Fortschritt, der Kultur neue Bahnen gebrochen hat.

War er auf der einen Seite kühn genug all' die Glaubenssätze von der Offenbarung und von der Bibel-Echtheit über den Haufen zu werfen und auf der anderen Seite so konservativ, um der Reform im entscheidenden Augenblick zum ewigen Verdruss Geiger's schwere Streiche zu versetzen, so dürfen wir nicht übersehen, dass Zunz zu gross dasteht, um bloss einer Partei oder Richtung anzugehören, und dass allen Sterblichen ein Mass gesetzt ist, das sie nicht überschreiten sollen. Er lebte, von allen Brüdern verehrt und hochgeachtet, er starb, von Allen tief betrauert.

Uns aber präge das nunmehr abgeschlossene Leben die eine grosse Mahnung zum Purimsabbath in's Herz: Die Kenntniss des Judenthums ward durch Zunz wie für Zunz: Licht, Wonne und Würde; Aller Blick hell, alle Herzen heiter und hoffnungsvoll gestaltend, aller Menschenklassen Ehre und Achtung erweckend. Was uns in der grossen Krisis, in der traurigen Oede, in der sich das Judenthum heute befindet, so machtlos, so hilflos und so hoffnungslos macht—das ist die Unwissenheit, die heute bei den Juden herrscht.

Es gibt keine Klasse Gebildeter, unter denen heute wirkliches Wissen so wenig gilt, deren Männer und Frauen so wenig wahrhafte Freude und Genuss an edler Lektüre, an Belehrung und Selbstausbildung finden, als die Juden. Man mag verblendet genug sein, es in Abrede zu stellen, wahr ist

es deshalb doch. Die Unkenntniss unserer Juden ist in Amerika, auch derer die die Schule besucht haben, erschreckend gross und ihr Geschmack roh. Woher soll da Liebe zum Judenthum und Begeisterung für seine Mission kommen? Wie kann da die Reform Fortschritte machen, wenn das junge Geschlecht nur an tollen Vergnügungen und höchstens noch an einem bischen Prunken mit Wohlthätigkeit ihre ganze Lust und Interesse finden? Jeder Nichtjude kennt die jüdische Literatur und Geschichte besser als der Jude. Woran kann der Prediger anknüpfen? —Und wenn Israel Gottes Ziele mit seinem Priestervolke nicht kennt, woher soll die nichtjüdische Welt das Judenthum verstehen und würdigen lernen? Wenn Israel sich seiner Aufgabe nicht bewusst ist, sich seines Namens schämt, woher soll den Völkern der Glaube an Israels heilige Mission kommen? Wenn der Jude sich selbst aufgibt, wie soll der Nichtjude ihn ehren und achten lernen? Es gibt nur ein einziges Mittel, nur einen einzigen Weg zum Heil, zur Rettung, zum Sieg, zum Fortschritt, und das ist: Kenntniss, Wissen, Lehre. Ob Reformer oder Orthodoxer, hier allein kann wieder Leben, Wärme, Licht, Würde und Selbstbewusstsein geschaffen werden.—Der Amalekgeist kam, weil das Wissen, das Lernen, die Liebe zum Judenthum und seiner Lehre erschlaffte. Wohlan—fördert, wecket, facht wieder an das Licht der jüdischen Belehrung in den Häusern, den Religionsschulen, den Gotteshäusern, unter Reich wie Arm, nah und fern, hebt und hilft, wo es gilt, Lehranstalten zu erhalten und zu schaffen—So ehrt Ihr den grossen Todten, so gedenkt Ihr dankend des Namens Leopold Zunz!

Wir sollten mehr Anstalten und Institute haben, die die wahre, echte Wissenschaft des Judenthums fördern und heben. Wir sollten neben den vielen Wohlthätigkeitsvereinen, die nur an den Leib und das Leibliche denken, auch einen Literaturverein haben, der, wie so viele christliche Anstalten der Art, der Gunst und Protection der Reichen und Grossherzigen sich erfreuend, die Pflege der Lehre, der Wissenschaft um Gottes und der heiligen Sache willen hebt und unterstützt, und so den Namen Leopold Zunz verewigt, damit auch der Geist, die Intelligenz, die Er-

kenntniss im amerikanischen Judenthum wieder geweckt und dasselbe aus der Verflachung und Verdummung zum frischen, gesunden und kräftigen Leben, Denken und Empfinden, zum rechten Fortschritt, zur Erfassung seiner grossen, geschichtlichen Mission geweckt werde, damit so uns und allen Juden Licht und Wonne, Würde und Selbstgefühl wieder zu Theil werden. Amen!

JEWISH WIT AND HUMOR

AN OLD philosopher once characterized man as the only creature that laughs. Indeed, weeping and whining are shared by other animals, but laughing is the sole privilege of man, if we except the grin of his counterfeit, the monkey. Both laughter and weeping are natural outlets of exuberant pleasure or pain. Children, or men in a lower state of culture, laugh and cry the loudest and wildest on occasion. Refinement and culture check and restrain these expressions of joy and grief, though not to the benefit of our health. Nature wants us to have a good laugh or cry, as the occasion demands it, and seeks redress when repressed by intellectual advancement. If by age or education we have outgrown those pranks and sports which, in a lower state, make man burst forth into unbounded laughter, we are forced into a smile by sights or sounds which afford us pleasant surprise by their quaintness and odd contrast. Here lies the source of wit and humor. The more serious and trying the aspect of life is, the greater becomes the demand for mirth and glee. This is undoubtedly the reason why the winter was in olden times throughout all lands selected for the season of public sport and fun. Carnival and Purim have one and the same origin. It has been observed that our age, and above all the American people, enjoy and crave for coarser fun than the educated classes of former generations, not so much because taste has degenerated, but because the greater strain on the mind demands a stronger reaction. Humor and wit are, therefore, far more appreciated than rich intellectual food. Shakespeare, the keenest observer of human nature, wisely summons his host of jesters and clowns on the stage to divert his audiences, lest the sympathetic sorrow elicited by the heroes of his great tragedies overstrain their feelings. In like manner do wit and humor come to our relief when the dreariness or tragic earnestness of the great struggle of existence threatens to unnerve us. Nothing offers so good a safeguard against despondency as the

power to enjoy the humorous side of things in the midst of embarrassment.

This is probably the chief reason why the Jews, as a class, excel in wit and humor. The disappointments and adversities they had to encounter, the overwhelming powers they had to contend with, whetted their intellect into a sharp, bright steel which flashed forth its dazzling splendor to overawe their foe. "How can feeble Israel maintain himself against his brother Esau, whose power lies in the sword?" the rabbis in the Midrash ask, and their answer is: "Watch the little worm battling with the mighty oak, and see how with its little mouth, gnawing and boring, it saps the large tree. Thus will Israel's tongue of steel overcome the iron force of his adversaries. And again, watch the storm lashing all its furies against the tender rose-bush. Yet the more the thorns wound and lacerate the rose, the sweeter is the perfume it sends forth to shame its aggressor." Jewish wit has well been likened to the *shamir* (worm or diamond) in the Solomon legend which cuts the hardest rock without hammer or chisel. It strikes deeper than all other powers. In yielding to the brutal force of his assailants, the Jew held up that weapon which hit back with unsparing strength, betraying his superior powers. Boerne, in his famous oration on Jean Paul, says: "Wit is peculiar to the Orientals. It is the great censor who speaks when truth dares not raise its voice; the people's tribune, whose power is stronger than that of kings; the advocate of justice, who reveals God when no one sees Him; the principle of democracy in the realm of the spirit." And humor he calls the king's clown who may with immunity tell things otherwise forbidden, truth told under the fool's cap and with exceptional privileges of the carnival time. And in almost the same words Carlyle and Boerne assert that humor and wit emanate from the heart more than from the head. Indeed, it is the warm, loving heart, wounded at the sight of human folly, which, like the nightingale, gives forth its elegiac strains in the shape of humor or wit, whereas cold hearts weep or laugh in haughty solitude. Quickness of the mind to perceive the ridiculous sides of things is the first requisite of wit. It is a gift of nature, but it may be sharp-

ened by exercise, by games which require prompt answers. This was done by rabbinical dialectics, but also by popular diversions. We find, in history or legend, the Jews of old glorying in King Solomon's exploits of wit in solving the riddles of King Hiram and the Queen of Sheba, who, however, proved no equals to him. The solving of puzzles remained for all centuries past one of the favorite amusements of the Jews. It often humored scholars into a more diligent study. The entire rabbinical and mediaeval literature, therefore, abounds with spicy, witty, and humorous sayings. Add to this the Jew's rare versatility and aptness in acquiring the languages, the sayings and tales of other nations, and we need not wonder at finding him endowed with unusual capacity for wit and humor. Thus the larger part of the popular wisdom contained in folklore and fable, and collected or utilized by Cervantes and Boccaccio, LaFontaine and Gellert, Chaucer and Shakespeare, was imported by Jews from the East.

Jewish wit has, according to a fine observer, its peculiarity in the sharp points it loves, not so much for the sake of wounding others, as for the purpose of displaying acrobatic skill. So, for instance, when looking at a portrait showing little resemblance to the original, a Jew exclaimed: "Remarkably well done! But tell me, pray, whose picture is it?" As the counterpart of this let me quote the witty remark made by Anselm Rothschild when the famous sculptor Thorwaldsen was introduced to him. "You look so handsome, chevalier, that one is led to believe you created yourself." Many striking samples of Jewish wit may be quoted from the Talmud. For instance, when a scoffer once remarked: "The God in your Bible is a thief, because he stole Adam's rib," rabbi Gamaliel rejoined: "Do your thieves steal iron and place gold in its stead? Why, God stole a bone and gave the fairest of woman instead." A Roman matron once mockingly asked: "I wonder what your God does, ever since He made the world?" Rabbi Josér replied: "Do you not see ladders being set for people to go up and down in the world? Do you not find persons matched together who have never seen each other before? This is God's work." The brilliant master of lore, Joshua

Ben Ḥananiah, had an unseemly face, and, on seeing him once in conversation with her father, the Emperor Hadrian, the princess cried out: "Oh, what an ill-looking frame for so fine a mind!" Quickly he answered: "Princess, which wine keeps better, the one in earthen or the one in silver vessels? God wanted my mind to be well kept." In fact, rabbi Joshua Ben Ḥananiah in Rabbinical tradition plays the same rôle as the sage Æsop does in Greek literature. And what is still more remarkable, we possess in the Midrash a large account of feats of wit and humor by which the men of Jerusalem excelled the men of Athens, only two of which I will, on account of their brevity, mention. An Athenian merchant coming to Jerusalem handed to a little child a penny and good-humoredly said: "Get me something to eat that lasts for to-day and leaves some over for my trip to-morrow." Unembarrassed by the task the child went to the grocer and brought a little bag of salt. The witty stranger was outwitted by the Jewish child. A rich merchant of Jerusalem died in Athens and bequeathed his whole fortune to his slave, only granting his son permission to select one single object for himself. The son, always fondly beloved by his father, was disconcerted at the news and went to his teacher to complain. But the teacher said: "You fail to see the wisdom of your father, who, dying in a strange land, having none but the slave with him, desired to prevent him from seizing the whole property by bequeathing it all to him, and now you are expected to come and seize the slave as your piece of property, whereby legally all becomes yours again."

We must not forget that, in order to stand in manly defence of his race and his faith, the Jew needed a good schooling in intellectual warfare, a double-edged sword and an impenetrable armor. How often was the impertinent question asked: "Why are you Jews usurers?" Some Jewish wit then told the story: "Cheese was lying in the kitchen, and a mouse came and ran off with it, but what did people say? The mice have eaten the cheese. A single Jew is the transgressor, and the whole people is blamed for it." Arguments seldom convince the prejudiced mob. Caustic wit alone silences them. "Did you hear of that Jew who

was hung for forgery?" the crowd loudly cried forth in the Jew's hearing. "And do you think the gallows ought to be monopolized by you?" was the quick repartee, given in one of Berthold Auerbach's stories. "Why do you not bow before our crucifix?" a crowd in a procession asked a Jew. "I knew it when it was a cherry tree," was the scathing reply. As deep-rooted diseases often require the surgeon's knife, the cutting wit of Heine, Boerne, and Disraeli was necessary to command the world's respect for the despised and outlawed Jew. Like the French revolution, it had to work by storm. It opened the sealed lips of the timid Jew, imbuing him with new courage and self-consciousness. True enough, Heine was often too bold, too frivolous, too aggressive and destructive; but his thunders shook Germany, as Voltaire's shook France and the wide world. His flashes were lightning to set literature ablaze with a new fire. They purified the atmosphere. Well might he, in referring to his being born about the first of January, 1800, jocosely say: "I am the first man of the century." He continued the work of Mendelssohn and of Napoleon in liberating Germany from the nightmare of mediæval prejudice. There is very little in literature to match Heine's essays on Shakespeare's women as regards wit and humor. Yet, see how he starts who "needed," as he said, "the certificate of baptism as a card of admission into Christian society." "I knew a good Christian in Hamburg who never could be reconciled to the thought that his Lord and Saviour was a Jew by birth, the Ideal of Perfection being of that same tribe that harms him in his coffee trade, and exactly as that excellent son of Hammonia feels about Jesus Christ, I feel about William Shakespeare having been an Englishman by birth." And read the last two chapters in which he writes on Jessica and Portia in *The Merchant of Venice*, wielding a sword which cuts into the very bone. "When I saw the play given in Drury Lane, a handsome pale British lady stood behind me who cried bitterly at the end of the fourth act and exclaimed: 'The poor man is wronged!' I shall never forget those big black eyes which wept for Shylock. Why, Shylock is the most respectable person in the whole play. True, he loves money, but more than

money he regards satisfaction for his wounded heart. When in Venice I looked all over the Rialto for Shylock with his shrill 'Three thousand ducats!' But I did not find him, or else I would have told him that his cousin Herr von Shylock, in Paris, has since become the mightiest baron in Christendom, and was decorated by her Catholic Majesty with the badge of the order of *Isabella*, founded for the glorification of the expulsion of the Jews and Moors from Spain."

How piercing is every word in these sentences! And how grand is his wit when coupled with true sentiment! As, f. i., when he says, "I cannot believe that Og, the giant king of Bashan, reached Moses in size. How small does Sinai itself appear when Moses stands on its top. The mountain is only a pedestal upon which the feet of the man rest, whose head reaches into the sky where he converses with God. In former times I did not particularly like Moses, probably because I, being of Hellenic disposition, could not forgive him his dislike of all plastic art. But I now find that his artistic genius outranked all. He carved colossal figures, he carved men, while all the Greeks remained but fine youths. Yes, the son of Amram and of the midwife, Jochebed, reared a monument which outlasts all masterpieces of sculpture. Take good care of the Jews. They are the body-guard of God. Your water dries too quickly. They have it all cut into the flesh." But Heine and Boerne must be read, not quoted, as proofs of wit and humor. Heine was right after all when he said, after the Jew-hater Menzel had been to see him, "I feel dull; Menzel and I have exchanged thoughts." German literature was dull; Jewish wit brought new vigor and sprightliness into it. And the very same thing may be said of Mendelssohn's time. How much Lessing's bright genius owed to his great Jewish friend is hard to tell. It certainly is no mere accident that the kernel and substance of his great drama, Nathan the Wise, the fable of The Three Rings, told by a Jew when entrapped by Sultan Saladin into the perplexing question which of the three religions was the best, borrowed from Boccaccio, is of Jewish origin.

Mendelssohn's wit probably did more to pave for him

the way into literature and to social recognition than did his erudition. You are undoubtedly familiar with the anecdote of Pastor Teller asking Mendelssohn:

"Why do you not in the Son as well as in the Father believe,
Since you gladly credit the Father with what to the Son you give?"

whereupon Mendelssohn replied:

"How can I in the Son have belief,
Knowing the Father does forever live?"

And no less known is his fine rejoinder, when King Frederick II. reproached him for his daring as a Jew to censure a work written by him, the king: "A king who writes is like a king playing ten pins, who is bound to submit to the verdict of the little bowling boy at the other end." Less known is the story how he, seeing his friends provoked at the Hep Hep cry raised at them as Jews by the children on the street whenever they passed, first distributed little coins among them, telling them to cry as loud as they could, which they gladly did, and still more so when the money was given a second time. But no sooner did Mendelssohn stop giving them money than the little urchins stopped crying Hep! Hep! altogether. Perhaps the finest bit of humor is how the sage wooed his wife. Mr. Guggenheim, a Hamburg merchant, wanted his daughter to become the famous philosopher's wife, but when she saw the hunch-backed man she would not give her consent to marry him. So, speaking about marriages being made in heaven, he told her: "A strange thing happened when I was born. My name was then, as usual, called out in heaven, and at the same time the name of her who was destined to be my wife; but to my surprise I heard that she was to be born with a hump-back. O God! I exclaimed, it ill behooves a woman to be deformed whose destiny is to be lovely. Give me the hump-back, O Lord, and let her be well formed and pleasing." She at once threw herself around his neck and consented to become his wife.

The whole life of the Jew in his Ghetto inclosure was of a nature to make him perceive the humorous side. He caught up every quaint story or witticism he heard, and applied it to his own surroundings. To give two instances: "When

to eat cheese from a Christian table was considered a great sin, a Jew, tempted to partake of the rare delicacy, was all at once interrupted by a heavy thunderstorm, whereupon the innocent novice took the cheese and threw it out of the window, exclaiming, 'O Heaven! What a noise on account of that little piece of cheese!'" The same anecdote is told in France regarding a Christian eating an omelet on a fast day, and has given rise to the proverb "Tant de bruit pour une omelette!" The anecdote about the wife of the rabbi of Keltersbach, who, not knowing whether to go with her Christian neighbor to church or with her husband to the synagogue, went with both, saying: "One of them is surely right," has its parallel in the English pastor, Bray, who was undecided whether Protestantism or Catholicism was right and followed both. Likewise Jewish, and also old Teutonic, is the quaint tale of an unlucky man who moved into another country in search of better fortune, but no sooner had he brought wife and children and all his furniture into the wagon than, on closing the door behind him, he heard a knock, and on reopening it, lo! Ill-luck, or *Schlimm Massel*, was there ready to accompany him to the new destination. But we had better say that under his many trying circumstances, good humor would never leave the Jew. And his best friend remained his wit. The feeling of the superiority of his intellect over all the little things that harassed him kept him fresh and brave.

The feeling of superiority over pagan folly caused Abraham at the dawn of history to knock down his father's idols, and then placing a stick into the hand of the biggest one, to assert: "The big god here has killed all the little gods!" It was the same grim humor which makes Heine's rabbi, in his contest with the monk, say: "We Jews understand the rule of three better than you; we cannot accept your Three Make One;" or a Disraeli proudly asserts: "Half of the world worships a Jew and the other half a Jewess;" or Rabbi Meissel, at the Diet of Lemberg in 1848, when asked why he took his seat to the left, whereas all the bishops sat on the government's side, give the famous answer: "Because we Jews have no rights." Or to quote the latest Jewish pun: "The issue between Stoecker's and my party,"

said Paulus Cassel, a converted Jew, but still a Jew at heart, "is the question of *Hamanism* or *Humanism*." As long as the Jew is at best tolerated, but not fully recognized, his wit must serve as his sword, and his humor must reconcile him to his position in society. But with Boerne we point to the story of the traveller over whose head sun and storm quarrel as to which of the two was stronger. In vain the storm tries to force the wanderer to take off the cloak; the warm sun with its mild rays alone succeeds in ridding him of the mantle. Give us the warm cheering sunshine of tolerance and of civil and social recognition, and see whether the Jewish cloak will not be dropped. Jewish wit and humor will then amalgamate itself with the intellectual life of the nations, and as Gabriel Riesser said: "Jew and Christian will love their country as their common mother, and God as their common Father."

JEWISH SUPERSTITION

RELIGION must be a wing, not a shackle, a lifting power, not a leaden weight. It must cheer man, and not fill him with gloom; it must carry him upwards with hope, not paralyze him with fear. "Be not dismayed by the signs of heaven; the heathens are thus dismayed, but Israel's portion is the living God." In these words the great seer amidst the pangs and throes of Jerusalem's fall, has stated for all time the wide contrast between religion and superstition. Superstition is fear, religion is faith, comfort, health of the soul. Never does the sun shine in greater majesty than when its rays strike the clouds gathered on the eastern and western horizon at its rising or setting; but the moment it sinks, nothing remains but a black mass. When appearing in the garb of some impressive ceremony, religion attracts and holds the people in awe, but let the form lose its vitality, and you have but the dark shadow, a spectre, a sham. This is superstition. There is no term harsh enough, no penalty severe enough for Hebrew law-giver and prophet to exterminate any of these survivals of heathenism. Still you cannot drive out fear by threats and lashes. You cannot kill folly with the sword. Superstition dies but slowly. King Saul had prohibited all sorcery in his kingdom. Yet no sooner did he lapse into a state of despair, than he himself was happy to find, under the cover of the night, the necromancer of Endor and have her conjure up the spirit of the departed prophet. Nor does he alone stand guilty of superstitious belief. The very writer of the story, be he prophet or layman, entertains the same mischievous notion.

Both the Talmud and the New Testament are full of witchcraft and ghost stories. Before the Oriental mind the entire world swarmed with angels and demons. To know how to spell their names meant mastery over life and death, over heaven or hell. We to-day wonder at the thousand and one rites and formulas prescribed in Rabbinical

literature for every step and event of life. We must bear in mind that ceremonialism was the safeguard against all the hostile powers lying in wait for man on every high-road and every turn of the season. The old nature gods of heathenism, when expelled from their temples in the cities, moved out into the country haunting the fields and taking possession of the village-people. Hence the name of heathenism or paganism. Fear was the predominant trait of primitive man. He beheld everywhere only powers begrudging his prosperity and anxious to thwart his progress. Such dreary notions could not be rooted out by legislative measures nor by prophetic preaching. When king David took up the count of his war-like men, the Biblical narrative tells, a pestilence broke out in the land, greatly diminishing the number of the people, and had the king not quickly dedicated to God the tract of land threatened next by Satan's unsheathed sword, the scourge would have continued in its furious rage. I do not know what construction blind Bible-worshippers prefer to put upon this strange piece of sacred history. With all reverential love for the Book of Books, I have only one name for it. I call it—superstition.

But I propose to show that a great many people to-day still harbor in some dark corner of their heart the same stupid belief that by counting persons or things belonging to us we rouse the envy of evil spirits. In view of this the Mosaic law provided that each man enrolled on the list of the army should give half a shekel to the temple treasury in order to have the men mustered by counting the coins presented. A similar rule prevailed in Rome. When the citizens' census was taken, an expiatory sacrifice was offered to the gods to prevent any possible harm. Were you not also sometimes told not to count the persons assembled in the hall or around the table except in a round-about way, lest the evil eye might do some mischief? There are misers who dare not count their money, lest it grow less. They are probably right. The reminder of their obligations towards the needy might make them tremble. But I do believe that superstitious fear was, and still is, a necessary element in the progress of religion. Careful observation of

the various human tribes has convinced me that the custom of leaving the tithes, the corners of the field, and the firstlings of each year's produce to the priests and to the poor had its origin in the fear of divine powers begrudging man's increase of wealth, and was turned by our great prophets to good use in the service of humanity. Thus superstition often became an incentive to acts of benevolence, as was the case with mediæval charity, such as almsgiving for the sake of ransoming the sick from death or of the departed soul from hell-fire.

No child learns how to walk without stumbling, nor did mankind arrive at truth without ever falling into error. Columbus' great mistake led him to the discovery of a new hemisphere, and so did the alchemist's foolish search for the philosopher's stone establish the science of chemistry, and the absurd notions of the astrologer disclose the wonders of astronomy. Few of us, when wishing one another good morning, or a happy new year and good luck, think any longer of favorable and unfavorable stars, or of malign or blissful influences of persons and things we happen first to meet on certain occasions. Yet all our salutations, nay, even our benedictions and prayers resulted from the desire of counteracting such evil effects. They were originally incantations. When retiring at night, or when hailing the new week at the close of the Sabbath, the Jew of old, as well as the Christian or pagan, called upon the angels and good spirits to guide and shield him. Prayer was far more a prophylactic against evil spirits than an outpouring of humble devotion. For this reason the old ritual fails to strike a responsive chord in our heart. We no longer fear the waning and waxing moon, the rising and setting sun and stars, with all their supposed good and bad influences on hygiene. Nor do we, since Benjamin Franklin taught us how to ward off the lightning's stroke, feel prompted to allay our fear by reciting a benediction during a storm. Bad dreams no longer make us fast and pray. For years I felt puzzled by the quaint formula of prayer: "Blessed be God who calleth the dead to life," prescribed for the occasion of the return from a journey of a friend who had been reported dead, until, in a book on Eastern folklore, I read

how men reported dead had, before entering their house, to go through a certain process mimicking resurrection from death. And we also endeavor to avert an evil thus falsely announced by saying: "May it mean long life." Quite akin to this is a habit still familiar among us, never to mention death or illness without adding, by way of caution, a phrase like, "May it forebode no ill," and the like. For the same reason, people on Passover eve at the mentioning of each of the ten plagues dip their fingers into the wine-cup to pour out a drop, in order to turn off the evil spirits of the plagues named. Most people to this very day dislike to speak of their children in terms of praise, or of their own good state of health, without adding some expression allaying the fear that jealous powers might injure them. German and Jewish superstition dissuaded for the same reason three brothers from settling in the same town or from marrying three sisters. But for our Reform movement, no Jewish wedding would be celebrated to-day without breaking a glass, a custom prevalent among all sects and races of the East and the West, having the pacification of spirits begrudging our good fortune for its only object. In the same way King Polycrates, in Schiller's well-known poem, casts his ring into the sea to avert a sudden turn of his good luck.

Nor do I exaggerate if I say that all the old formulas of taking an oath, as well as ordeals and vows, all ritualism, whether Jewish, Christian, or pagan, rest on superstition. Not only was the Christian cross an amulet, a magic sign, before it became the mark of the Church, but the so-called Shield of David, the cabbalistic pentagram, which you now find as a sign over Jewish houses of worship, is also a charm often used by Jewish amulet-writers. And do you want to know the real origin of the *tephillin* or phylacteries, the leather capsules containing Bible passages attached with leather strings to arm and forehead, the *mezuzzah*, wooden or tin capsules containing similar Bible writings, fixed to the door-posts, and the *zizit*, certain fringes on the four borders of a garment tied into mysterious numbers of knots? Well, you find them all over Asia and Africa, used alike by Mohammedan, Christian, Parsee, and

pagan, as amulets for the protection of the body and the house against evil powers. Every spring the people of Rome and of China, as also the Teutonic and the Arabic tribes, used to sprinkle their door-posts with the blood of some sacrifice to keep malevolent spirits off the house. And watch the remnant of the old northern Israelite, the Samaritan. You can still see him take the blood of the Passover lamb and put some on the arm and the forehead, as was undoubtedly also done by our ancestors in Palestine, after the sprinkling of their door-posts with the sacrificial blood. Or, to give you another striking instance how ancient customs survive while putting on new garbs, let me point to a strange survival of the scapegoat sent out on Atonement Day to the demon of the wilderness to carry off the sins of the people laid upon its shoulder by the high-priest. You find it in the custom, discountenanced by the leading authorities and yet adhered to by the people, of swinging a fowl around a person's body, and rendering it a sort of vicarious sacrifice a day or two before the Day of Atonement, after the recitation of a certain formula. Almost all the practices attached to this and the other autumnal holidays rest on the belief that, at this turn of the season, the destiny of man or the fertility of the year is being decided. According to the Talmud, the spirits of the dead overhear the decrees read for the year in heaven, and tell them to each other so that the initiated holy men may catch up the report.

But these and similar notions, such as beginning the year under favorable auspices, are no more Jewish than they are Christian. Superstition is the most democratic and cosmopolitan of all lore. It is confined to no country. It is well-nigh the same the world over, because it goes back to the lowest strata of human culture. But, like the river which attracts the chemical qualities of the various parts of land it traverses, the Jew, with his remarkable receptive and retentive powers, preserved alongside of the wisdom also the folly and superstition of all the races with which he came into contact. Consequently Jewish superstition casts a great deal of light upon that of other nations, and at the same time receives it from them. Thus, f. i., Teutonic mythology speaks of a drop of blood falling from heaven

on St. John's Day, that is in midsummer solstice. Egyptian folklore has a drop of blood fall from heaven at the time when the Nile begins to rise, while Jewish superstition had it fall at the turn of the four seasons, when our mothers of old were especially on their guard to put iron into every fluid, milk or water, lest the wandering spirits may, by drinking of it, do some harm to the household. Both Jewish and Slavonic superstition warns against the evil spirit raging during the hot dogdays at noon, the one picturing him as a sort of gigantic man with one eye on the forehead, the other as a blood-thirsty woman. Here, of course, nature has lent the color to the portraiture. But there is also an unmistakable family resemblance between the Roman, the English, and Scotch custom not to marry in May, and the Jewish not to celebrate nuptials in the month of Iyar. Both originate in the heathen notion that to marry before the May Queen or the Goddess of Fertility has celebrated her nuptials at the sight of the new vegetation, would provoke her wrath. The story of the death of so many thousand pupils of R. Akiba having occurred in these days is only a late invention to explain the strange habit.

To give you another example how Jewish and pagan superstition often coincide and explain each other, I will allude to a quaint custom I remember having seen practised, that of running to the well immediately after the close of Sabbath, in order to be so fortunate as to get a drink of the ever-wandering fount of Miriam, which bestows excellent health upon man. The German legend tells of Virgin Mary wandering about at the same time with water for the purpose of doing some washing according to some; according to others, for the sake of quenching the fire of hell, because on Sunday the Christian hell stops torturing the wicked, just as the Jewish Gehenna is cooled down on Saturday. Particularly striking is the similarity of superstitious practices observed by Jew and Gentile with regard to the great turning-points of life: birth, marriage, and death. While in the two former cases, the babe or the bride must be guarded in hundred ways against mischievous spirits eager to interfere with her happiness, the customs

connected with death are, without exception, dictated by the prevailing fear lest the dead may return and hurt the living. A window is opened in order that the soul may find its way out; a light kindled to show it its path; water emptied, in order that it may not, while bathing, leave all its impurities behind, or, as the Jewish writers say, in order that the drop of blood left on the sword of the angel of death may not remain in the house. In Talmudical times, beds were turned upside down; in latter times, clocks were stopped, looking-glasses were covered. This is just as much a Western as Oriental custom. In South Africa they burn the whole tent where a death occurred, because, according to primitive belief, the dead has a right to claim his whole house and possession. The cutting of hair, of garments, the avoidance of taking regular meals before some stranger has offered the eggs as symbols of the turning fate and the like; and all the other funereal rites have sprung from the desire of offering certain sacrifices to the dead to have him part in peace. True, many of these rites have long since become expressions of tender piety, but there is nothing absolutely Jewish or religious in the form.

"Children, ye are of the Eternal your God! display no wild, excessive, grief in cutting wounds into your flesh or in tearing your garments." This alone is a Jewish precept. "Be perfect with your God, and put your whole trust in His benign guidance." This is prophetic teaching. The righteous man has his guiding star, his talisman within him. No lucky or unlucky day, number or sign for him. Let me, for the sake of combating a general mistake, add here that the number thirteen derives its unlucky character not from the New Testament, but from Teutonic folklore, because the thirteenth god, that is the one standing outside of the sacred number of the twelve rulers of Asaheim, is Loki, the fire god of the nether-world, afterwards identified with his Satanic majesty. According to the Jews and all Eastern people, pairs, that is, all even numbers are exposed to the influence of demons, while odd numbers were considered lucky. So are Monday and Wednesday, the second and fourth day, regarded in the East as unlucky, while Friday became thus only in the West. All these things may

appear trifles and too ludicrous to be touched upon. But as Baruch Spinoza said: "I do not wish to laugh at people's follies, I want to study them in order to understand them; and thus rise above them." Manifold experience has taught me that those very people who prate of their infidelism all the year round are the very first to resort to superstitious practices in hours of trouble in order to ease their mind. Man wants some power to cling to, and where reason and knowledge fail, will-of-the-wisps take the place of the bright lamp of faith. No longer believing in God, they recur to ghosts and goblins. What causes spiritualism in this era of enlightenment to make such great headway in the upper classes of society? Modern science with its touch has burnt up the last loop-holes of superstition. Critical research has shaken the foundations of Church dogma and Bible authority. Demonism is gone. So they want to find in spiritualism a ladder leading from earth to heaven, from man to the Unseen Master of life. But spiritualism is no less a superstition than any other. It even is worse than folly. It frequently leads to madness.

Thank God, in spite of all the cabbalistic mysticism befogging the rabbis of the East and of the West, in spite of all the superstition codified in Joseph Caro's System of Jewish Conduct, the Jewish intellect retained its brightness and freshness. Over against the many great men of the middle ages who, like Kepler and Melanchthon, in spite of their brilliance, believed in astrology, there stood, as a beacon of light, the clear-minded sage of Cordova, Moses Maimonides, holding up the banner of a pure, unalloyed faith in God, to whose wise decrees man must humbly submit, without taking refuge in any power beside Him. Through his writings, Moses Mendelssohn grew to be the redeemer of the modern Jews from the bondage of superstition. This work of redemption, however, is not completed yet. If to-day people turn away dissatisfied from the old religious practices, it is because they long for a religion which is all sunshine, tinging even the clouds surrounding the world above and beyond with purple and gold to render them robes around God's majesty. People want a religion which draws man upward, as the light does the plant,

opening all the avenues of his soul, one which really redeems man, making him stand firm, like an Atlas, carrying a world upon his shoulders, and trusting in His divine powers, while bent upon rearing a kingdom of truth, of justice, and of love; a kingdom of God on earth. Only when freed from the last remnant of superstition does Judaism promise to become such a religion, to inspire man with unbounded faith in God and humanity.

THE ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS TOWARD JEWISH LITERATURE

GOETHE says: "When you draw the picture of an angel, omit not by way of contrast the one of the devil." I have no angels for my subject, but scholars who are not always angelic, and I feel that by way of contrast I ought to begin with such Christian scholars as are, or were, eager to sit at the feet of the Jew, though most of them do not belong to that class. "The Jew," says Geiger, "is, as a rule, חכם מכל אדם wise, inasmuch as he always endeavors to acquire wisdom from non-Jewish sources." Probably the fact of his being in the minority ever awakened the desire in him of knowing what the other side thinks, though the regard of other people's opinion למה יאמרו הגויים has always guided his footsteps. The Christian, on the other hand, has the majority and an iron-cast creed on his side; why should he care about the Jew's opinion concerning him?

There are a number of Christian scholars who deserve an honorable mention for earnestly wishing to see the Christian horizon enlarged by the study of Judaism. Foremost among them is E. Schuerer, whose history of the Jews in New Testament times was a revelation to many Christian scholars, and is, indeed, an indispensable work for the Jewish student, whatever its shortcomings may be. It is written from the angular point of the New Testament, and therefore loses sight of the inner and fuller life of Judaism, as has been pointed out by Schechter and Abrahams in the Jewish Quarterly Review. It is not a complete index of Jewish life, but it is a fair attempt at portraying it. His *Leben unter dem Gesetz* is, as Schechter has well said, not life, but death or life petrified; still so long as Jewish scholarship does not supply the need in a more satisfactory form, the blame falls upon it.

Far more biased, or tendenz-ful, is *Das System der altsynagogalen Theologie*, by Weber, a pupil of Franz Delitzsch, who was a friend of the Jews, but at the same

time a worker for Christian conversionism. The writer shows a tolerable acquaintance with the Agadic literature in Talmud and Midrash, but he wrote for the purpose of showing the inferior character of Jewish to New Testament teachings, and therefore he not only gives as a system of theology what he happens to find in Jewish sources where the very idea of system does not exist, each opinion expressed being more or less an individual one and of no authoritative character, but he frequently forces occasional utterances into harsh principles, and narrows broader views voiced so as to suit his purpose. He is unjust and unreliable, because he is constantly guilty of sins of omission and commission. Let me, because it is a storehouse of Jewish learning for Christian theologians, give you a few specimens. Dwelling on the attributes of God, he says that the expression frequently used, *Abinu shebashamayim*, 'Our Father in heaven,' denotes only God as the Father of Israel, and he refers to *Yoma IX, 18*. There *R. Akiba's* well-known saying occurs: "Happy are ye, people of Israel; who purifies you? and before whom do ye purify yourselves? Before your Father in heaven; for it says: The hope of Israel is God," '*Mikveh*,' however, signifying both hope and gathering of water, that is bath, he takes it in the latter sense with unmistakable reference to Christian baptism. God himself is the source of your purification; and no mediator is required. In order to make Jesus appear as 'the Son who alone knows the Father,' to use New Testament language, Weber falsifies the Jewish saying and renders it almost senseless. Very characteristic is the following sin of omission. In order to show the worthlessness of the heathen world in the eyes of God and Israel, he quotes a number of passages from the late Midrashim, in which a share in the world to come is denied to the Gentiles, omitting the overwhelmingly large number of older utterances stating that 'the righteous among the Gentiles have a share in the future world,' which have been collected by Zunz in his *Geschichte und Literatur*, and which have been accepted by the leading rabbinical authorities. There are hundreds of such wilful misrepresentations in Weber's book. But he wrote in the service of the Church, and

has no doubt been accorded a choice seat in the Christian heaven.

Really fair-minded is Professor Wuensche in Dresden, another pupil of Delitzsch. His translation of the larger part of all the Midrashim is of great help to those who cannot read the original, and I believe there are some such rabbis in this country. Poor man! his "Erlaeuterungen der Evangelien, aus Talmud und Midrash" which is a modest way of explaining the New Testament sayings by Rabbinical parallels and without which many a lecture on Jesus and the Talmud by our popular rabbis would never have been written, marred his professional success, because official Christianity dares not draw such comparisons. Professor Strack of Berlin, another pupil of Delitzsch, was somewhat more cautious in his love for Talmudical studies. He translated a number of Mishnaic treatises, wrote instructive articles on the Talmud and reviewed works of Jewish scholars, but left New Testament theology severely alone. He nobly defended the Jews against the horrible blood accusations, and we are grateful for little favors received.

Last, but not least on the honor roll, stands Isaac Taylor, of Cambridge, England, a pupil of Professor Schechter, whose work on Pirke Abot, The Ethical Sayings of the Fathers, may be called classical. The notes and the appendix offer a mine of information to the student of Talmud and New Testament literature. So, for instance, it shows the Rabbinic origin of the so-called Lord's Prayer, upon which Harnack bases half of his theory of the unique greatness of Jesus Christ.

It is, however, a great mistake to ascribe broad-mindedness to the Christian theology of our age. The Reformation owes a great deal of its liberating power to the impulse given by the study of Hebrew literature. Reuchlin, in 1520, was the first in Germany to point out its importance. He, the great defender of the Talmud against the assaults of Pfefferkorn, the Jewish renegade, and the Dominican monks, loved Rabbinical literature, if only because its Cabbala seemed to explain to him the mysteries of Christian dogma. At any rate the Reformers welcomed the aid of

the Jews, by which to unlock to them those treasures of the Bible, to which the Church had for centuries closed the eyes of all. Luther's Bible and the King James version inaugurated a new era for Hebrew studies as well as for popular education through the vernacular. The end of the sixteenth and the seventeenth century produced the greatest students of Rabbinical literature Christendom ever had, our own time included.

Foremost among these was Johannes Buxtorf, whose Hebrew (that is, Biblical) and Rabbinical (that is, Chaldaean) Dictionary, his Concordance and *Synagogua Judaica*, furnished learned Christendom with the means of penetrating into the secluded chambers of Jewish learning. A professor at the University of Basle, not forty years after Servetus had been burned at the stake on account of his Unitarian heresy, Buxtorf had the courage to associate and correspond with every Jewish scholar he could lay hold of, in order to be able to present the first rudiments of Jewish learning to the Christian world. Reuchlin, Sebastian Muenster, and Buxtorf were the morning stars that drew the night of mediaeval ignorance and stupor to its close by illumining the path of Hebrew study. England had its John Smith; its John Lightfoot in 1655, a Cambridge professor, whose *Harmony of the New Testament with the Old*, or, more correctly, whose illustrations of New Testament utterances by Rabbinical parallels are an admirable effort for a pioneer worker, and upon them Wuensche's work is based; its John Selden, whose works on the Jewish woman and the Synhedrion are still consulted as standard works.

Holland was next in order. This enterprising cosmopolitan people produced some of the greatest Bible commentators since the Spanish and French Jews had ceased interpreting Scriptures on a scientific system, and it was owing to them that our modern era of exegesis began taking the dusty Hebrew folios down from the shelves. Surenhuys translated the Mishna, Vitringa opened a new path for Bible exegesis, and then came the Orientalists ushered in by Albert Schultens.

Those sixteenth and seventeenth century scholars, while Christian believers, were sincere seekers after truth—no

anti-Semites, no Jew-haters, like so many of the leading Christian theologians to-day, who have a different measurement for Jewish and for Christian writings, while pretending to follow scientific methods. All our Bible critics, Old Testament critics like Reuss and Wellhausen, and New Testament critics like Harnack, Holzman and Canon Farrar, with very few exceptions—Cornill, for instance—are Christians only in so far as they hate whatever is Jewish. Like the dog in the fable, who, seeing his own picture reflected in the water, casts off the piece of meat in his mouth in order to seize upon that held by his supposed rival in the water, so do all these famous scholars cast away whatever is Jewish in Jesus and the New Testament, in order to make the Christ of their own fancy rise who has nothing in him of the Jew. They see not that Apollo and the Muses, whose kinship they claim rather than that of Sinai's God and the Hebrew covenant people, have nothing in common with the man of Golgotha.

Against these influences, which are of far more pernicious character than the summer hotel or similar ostracism the common crowd complain of with such bitterness, we Jews have to contend to-day, and this is why I think two great American movements have begun at the right time—the Jewish Encyclopedia, which is to open the eyes of Jew and Gentile to the doings of Judaism throughout the ages, and Schechter's coming here, to raise the standard of rabbinical education by insisting on something more than Fourth-of-July oratory. We need men conversant with the entire Jewish literature to map out for us a system of Jewish theology which challenges the Christian dogma after truly scientific methods. This has hardly been begun as yet.

As to the Jewish Encyclopedia, I cannot help saying that when starting this great work both editors and publishers had a right to expect a large number of subscribers from among Christian readers who ought to be interested in having Jewish life and literature portrayed to them, and, above all, the Old and New Testament presented to them by the kinsmen of Jesus and the Apostles, but we were disappointed. Our Christian confreres, theologians and laymen, do not care to hear the other side. They do not believe

in Lessing's beautiful dictum: "If God in His right hand would offer me the truth, and nothing but the truth, and in the other the longing after truth with the possibility of error, yet, with the incessant eagerness of coming near and ever nearer the truth, I would seize upon God's left hand and say, 'O Father, give me this, for the full truth is for Thee alone!'" Liberal Christian professors have neither the time nor the mind to read Jewish works which render their position only all the harder. A Christian layman occasionally ascertains the Jewish view regarding the origin of Christianity; a Christian theologian never, and he is probably right or wise in doing so.

Of all Christian theologians, the finest and most liberal one in America is, I think, Professor Toy, of Cambridge, Massachusetts, and yet, even he could not overcome the bias of the school. In his *Judaism and Christianity* he says: "We are not to regard the transition from Judaism to historical Christianity as the substitution of a perfect for an imperfect form of religion, but as an advance from an imperfect to a less imperfect form, the one which permitted the moral, spiritual truth, which is the germ of all religions, to assert itself with greater freedom, and exert its true influence more completely. For the Jewish scheme of obedience to a mass of precepts"—you see, he uses the stock-in-trade of all Christian theologians, and has not even read Claude Montefiore's *Hibbert Lectures* and the *Jewish Quarterly Review*,—"Paul substituted faith in Jesus as Redeemer—a vastly higher and freer conception." Strangely enough, Prof. Toy here forgot what he wrote in the earlier part of the work on Antigonus of Soko's well-known saying: "Be not like servants who merely wait on their master with the view of getting a piece from their master's table"—that virtue should spring from love of right and be accepted as its own sufficient reward. "This is an utterance which has no parallel in the Old Testament or the New." And yet, Paul's system, which renders religion a service for reward in heaven, and of fear of hell, a faith which turned God into the most cruel tyrant that ever ruled over men, is claimed to be more perfect than the Jewish! Is this cant, hypocrisy or narrowmindedness? Let

Prof. Toy read a little less of Christian cheap talk and apply himself to the study of Rabbinical treatises, and he will find that the 'greater freedom' is not in the religion in which he has been reared.

Much stronger is the contrast between Judaism and Christianity presented by Prof. Harnack, the leading Church theologian of Germany, whose lectures on *Das Wesen des Christenthums* before cultured Berlin created a stir on account of their liberal ideas. Mark well, he no longer believes in miracle, in the resurrection, although, as he himself says, historical Christianity rests on this vision of an entranced class of people, but he must have a dark background to make the portrait of Jesus shine forth as a God in heavenly lustre. So Pharisaism must be painted all black, Jesus represented as the preacher of a higher righteousness, as the one who revealed God as Father, and Paul, the founder of the Church dogma, as the one whose bright side was Greek, and whose dark side was Pharisean Judaism. The whole picture is untrue, because the background is covered with nothing but the dark and flimsy material of fiction and falsehood, of ignorance and prejudice. Would Harnack from sincere love of truth have familiarized himself with the facts of Jewish history and literature, as he is at home in Church history and literature, his picture would have dissolved itself into a *Fata Morgana*; he would have seen that Jesus was a Jew of lofty aspirations, yet nothing but a Jew.

In fact, no real comprehension of Jesus' sayings in the New Testament is possible without a thorough familiarity with the Talmud and Midrash, as Schreiner in his answer to Harnack, *Die neuesten Urtheile ueber das Judenthum*, and Schechter, Guedeman, Abrahams, and others have indicated. There is an exquisite saying of the Rabbis: "The Bible has been written down, and is in the hand of Jew and non-Jew, but the key to the Bible is the tradition that has been handed only to the Jew." That is to say: The Christians, in using the Bible, made it serve purposes altogether different from its original design, a dogmatic chain to fetter the intellect; the Jews use the Bible freely and rationally, because they are in possession of the key

which does not idolize every word, but applies it to various needs in accordance with the varying time. The best utterances of Jesus find their explanation in the Agadah. Take, for instance, the beautiful saying of Jesus: "Behold the birds of heaven! They sow not, neither do they reap, yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not of much more value than they? Behold the lilies of the field; they toil not, neither do they spin; yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God so clothes the grass of the field, shall He not much more clothe you, oh men of little faith." As soon as you compare it with an almost identical saying concerning the beasts and the birds in the Mishna, of the men that lack Emunah, 'faith,' and then take into consideration that the name of the purple lily in Palestine was 'the king's lily,' you recognize at once that that saying did not originate with one man, but with the whole class of Ḥasidim, whose chief teaching was trust in God, who gave the Manna as daily bread even in the wilderness, and not to give a thought to to-morrow's cares and troubles. The Midrash to Parshat ha-Man offers the key to this saying. So does the New Testament story of the widow's mite as being more than all the gifts of the rich find not only its parallel, but also its explanatory origin in the Midrash where the Biblical word *ve'im Nefesh ki takrib*, If a soul or person brings a sacrifice, is explained by the story of the widow who with her little gift offers her very soul.—You see here that as Agadist or expounder of a Biblical text, Jesus, or whosoever first offers the beautiful parable, taught the lesson in question. A few more of these New Testament sayings placed in the right light will convince you or any one who wishes to be enlightened, that their source is Synagogue teaching. What does it mean: "When thou givest alms sound not a trumpet before thee as the hypocrites do in the Synagogue! Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth, but let thine alms be in secret." The almsbox in the Temple, and also in the Synagogue, was called Shofar, trumpet, because it was bent shofar-like, so that money could be cast in but not taken out. So the teaching is, Do not cast your money with such ostentation into the

Shofar as to make it sound before all, and remember that "An abomination of God is the proud in heart, if he offers a gift from hand to hand he will not be free from punishment (Prov. XVI, 5) that is, the right hand should not see what the left hand doeth."

The other day I related in a sermon the Midrash story of Moses carrying the sheep that had gone astray on his shoulders back to the fold; after the sermon a lady came up to me and in the simplicity of her heart said: "I always thought that only Jesus was regarded as the good shepherd." I have since found that the Essenes had the story of the good and the bad shepherd well developed out of the well-known chapter of Ezekiel, long before the New Testament characters made their appearance.

And so I might go through the four Gospels and find without difficulty the Rabbinical parallels and originals to all the teachings and doings of Jesus. How can Christians with any sense of right speak of the Jews as having rejected Christ, if the Jews recognize Jesus as one amongst their hundreds of rabbis, even though he was in one direction or another more powerful or more interesting a personality than many of them? Let our Christian friends study the Jewish sources, and they will think and judge better of Judaism and also more humanly or sensibly of Jesus.

The other day a Christian theologian of my own city spoke of woman in the usual strain, as having been lifted by Christianity to the position which is hers by right and dignity. Of course, he spoke belittlingly of the women in the Old Testament, also of the 'Song of the Virtuous Woman' in Proverbs. I gave him an article of mine on The Jewish Woman in Post-Biblical Times, and he thanked me heartily for the new light offered. What a pity, then, that such opportunities are not sought for and solicited. They would be beneficial for both sides, Jew and Christian.

Let me close with a subject of more general interest. It is one of the axiomatic beliefs of Christianity that all the institutions of charity are the fruit of Jesus' teachings, who first made the care of the forsaken, the sick and the stranger, a duty of the community, and so on and so on. Accordingly

we are told by Lecky that hospitals were unknown before Christianity. "Christianity for the first time made charity a rudimentary virtue, giving it a leading place in the moral type and in the exhortations of its teachers. It effected a complete revolution by representing the poor as the special representatives of the Christian Founder, and thus making the love of Christ rather than the love of man the principle of charity" (*Hist. of Europ. Morals*, ii, 84). And Uhlhorn, who made a special study of the *Christliche Liebesthaetigkeit*, 1882, and wrote the article on *Wohlthaetigkeit* in Herzog's *Encyclopedia*, writes: "Organized charity is not known in Israel; almsgiving, but not institutions of benevolence, existed in post-exilic Judaism. Love in its true humane and universal sense was given to the world only by Christ. The founder of the Church not only taught and commanded, but practised true love and thus became the personal founder of a life of love. Until then there was but a world without love." These assertions, repeated in a thousand different books and addresses, are totally untrue.

Helene of Adiabene, in time of a great famine in Palestine, furnished the people of Jerusalem with ship-loads of corn and fruit, and her son, Izates, with money. These things were given, says Josephus, in charge of the first men of Jerusalem; that is to say, they were the charity administrators. An ancient Mishna says that those whose fathers have been administrators of charity need no further examination as to noble birth, and may marry into the highest priestly families. And in the face of such clear statements, that go back to pre-Christian times, high-ranking Christian writers assert that the church first organized the work of charity. But that is not all. All the Christian historians state it as an undisputed fact that the hospital is a Christian institution; that a certain Roman lady, Fabiola, a Christian convert, was the immortal founder of the first hospital, and a friend of hers and of St. Jerome soon afterwards founded an Inn for Strangers. What puzzled me when reading this in Uhlhorn's and Haeser's work on Christian charity was a strange remark of St. Jerome, the friend of the two so-called founders of the first hospital and poorhouse in the West:

"Thou hast now," he writes to his friend, "transplanted a branch of the terebinth of Abraham to the shores of the Ansonian river," that is, Italy. Only acquaintance with Rabbinical literature, such as St. Jerome possessed, who had a rabbi, Bar Ḥanina, as teacher, explains this mysterious utterance. The rabbis say that the terebinth, which Abraham planted at Bersheba, as well as the oak tree at Mamre, was turned into a Pandokeion, that is, inn for strangers, so that every needy and helpless one found relief and comfort under the shadow of that tree. In other words, the hospital planted by St. Pammachius and Fabiola under St. Jerome's influence in the West, originated in ancient Jewish practice traced back to Abraham. In fact, the whole East was dotted with such poorhouses, used now for the sick, and then for other classes of needy and distressed. In the West, where wealthy Roman women and men donated large amounts of money to the church for such purposes, there sprang up all sorts of asylums altogether new in their destination and character. In the East, the old form was retained, and the poorhouse used for all purposes. The work done by these institutions in the East was such that the Emperor Julian writes: "The Jews and the Christians put us heathens to shame. The Jews so provide for their own that there is no poor Jew found anywhere begging alms, and those Galileans take care even of the Gentile poor." Of these Christian charity institutions we learn that Jews have been found imposing upon them by allowing themselves to be converted over and over again only to obtain money. This, mind you, occurred in the fourth Christian century, not in 1902!

You observe, then, that the Jews had charitable institutions of their own like the Christians, only the latter did as they do to-day, made charity the means of conversion, and so extended it to outsiders; the Jews provide both for their own and for their Gentile fellowmen who appealed to their sympathy as townsmen. The Church pursued a policy of pauperizing the people by giving to the undeserving; the Jews already in Talmudical times, made charity a system of helpfulness, as can be learned from the old sources. But we are in the position to prove that already in the New

Testament time the work of charity was ramified and the branches of helping were diversified. Read the words put into the mouths of the Jews in Matt. 25, 35: "I was hungered and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me. Verily, inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Now these very ideas are taken from the synagogue again. The Midrash Shir hashirim Zutta, ed. Schechter, says: "My Corban, my bread. Does God need bread or a Corban? when you give to the poor, My friends, you give unto Me." So the seven kinds of good deeds, the feeding of the hungry, the visiting of the sick, the donating of the clothing, the burying of the dead, the dowering of the poor brides, the redemption of the captives—are Jewish. To them the Hasidim or Essene saints of each town devoted their whole time and labor. Only from this point of view the saying of Jesus is understood. Christianity is an outgrowth of the Essene fraternity. The Essene developed the whole system, and the Church adopted it.

I might go further into detail and show how the whole organization of the Church with its systematic provision for the poor and needy was derived from the Essene fraternities, who appear in Rabbinical and other writings as occupied exactly as the early Christians were with works of redeeming love and of feeling. But I had better bring my remarks to a close.

The Old Testament exegesis, with its higher criticism, has been placed upon a scientific basis only since Christian scholarship began to study Jewish literature and the Jewish grammarians, lexicographers and commentators, many of whom wrote in Arabic. The New Testament exegesis will never attain a truly scientific character unless Rabbinical literature is thoroughly studied and consulted as to the meaning and purpose of the various sayings and teachings of Jesus and the apostles, and as to the historical perspective from which alone the work of the nascent Christian sect can be understood.

Perhaps, after all, Christian theologians leave Jewish

studies alone, or else their views might be radically changed and their trinitarian belief be affected, the consequence of which would be that the Christian heaven would be shut to them, and as we Jews as lost souls have no Jewish heaven, they might be compelled to wander about until they settled down as members of the Church Universal, which is neither Jewish nor Christian, but which knows only of God's children.

ASSYRIOLOGY AND THE BIBLE

WE LIVE in an age of strange contrasts. Wherever we look we find a bold striving for new truths and a revival of old falsehoods, great achievements of human love and violent outbursts of cruel hatred, a wondrous progress of science and a tenacious clinging to superstitious notions, a courageous assertion of manhood and cowardly, cringing servility side by side. Nor are those circles which are expected to imbibe only the clarified air of truth and perfect justice longer immune against the contagion of prejudice, and the scholar whose scientific pursuits ought to lift him to serene realms of thought high above the passion of the multitude is too often seen in these days contributing his full share to the general confusion of the mind and the vexation of the spirit.

Such is the impression created by the two lectures on Babel and the Bible, delivered a year ago by Prof. Friederich Delitzsch before the Emperor and Empress of Germany, and sent forth with notes and preface in thousands and ten thousands of copies all over the world. Consider the simple fact. An Assyriologist of great fame and originality, the son of Franz Delitzsch, a Christian theologian and Bible exegete of great eminence whose latter years were chiefly devoted to the defense of Jew and Judaism against vile attacks by the anti-Semites, is invited to deliver a series of discourses before an august assembly at the royal palace of Berlin on the results of Babylonian research in their bearing upon Holy Scripture. And how does he avail himself of this rare opportunity? Far from being satisfied with the simple yet highly gratifying task of showing what flood of new light is cast upon the ancient Hebrew life by the Babylonian movements, and, how the highly developed Chaldean civilization, which is by millenniums anterior to the time of Moses and Abraham, furnished the Hebrews and their predecessors, the Canaanites, with all the elements of culture, with all the material forming the common beliefs,

customs and laws of the time, he ventures to make the most unwarranted assertions concerning the high moral and religious standard of Babylon, obviously for the purpose of belittling the Bible and casting a slur chiefly upon the Old Testament. Somewhat more guarded in this respect in the first lecture, in which he at least gave credit to the prophets and psalmists for their superior moral teachings, he makes his second lecture, which was to serve also as a reply to his critics who had censured him for his inaccuracies and for his lack of reverence for the Sacred Scriptures, the occasion of a fierce assault upon the Old Testament, its people and its God, and in a later preface he does not even shrink from charging the second Isaiah with tribalism and hatred of mankind.

It cannot be the object of my paper at this late time to refute the statements of Prof. Delitzsch. This has been done by eminent Assyriologists of Germany, France and America and leading Biblical scholars of all lands and creeds. It would be like carrying coal to Newcastle, should I attempt to show how far superior in their moral tenor the Bible stories of Creation and the Flood are to those first deciphered for us thirty years ago by the late George Smith, or how high above the cruel and lascivious deities of Assur and Babylonia with their wild orgies of passion and lust and their abominable rites, so shocking to every refined sentiment, Israel's God of holiness ranks, Whose eyes are too pure to bear the sight of evil and Whom none may approach who is not clean of hands and pure of heart. We willingly acknowledge our thanks to Prof. Delitzsch for having been the first to equip the student with the means of acquiring a systematic knowledge of the Assyrian language by his Assyrian Grammar and Dictionary, and for having also enlarged the horizon of the Biblical scholar by his many valuable publications and such instructive works as is *Das Paradies*. All the more deplorable it is to see a scholar of his repute so carried away by his antipathy to the theological systems, in which he was reared, if not by a morbid craving after sensationalism, as to place Babel, the 'mother of harlots,' as she is called in the Apocalypse of John, above the Bible, and instead of treating things sacred to millions

of people, whether Jews or Christians, with befitting respect, scoff and sneer at Jehovah in the language of the Boulevard. And our disgust at such frivolous disregard of the religious feelings of the people is mingled with surprise at the fact that this harangue, worthy only of an eighteenth century rationalist, should have so impressed the German Emperor that he felt that henceforth Israel was—so he wrote to Admiral Hollmann—"shorn of its prestige as the people of God."

How is it possible, we ask ourselves, that a man of the erudition and standing of Prof. Delitzsch should be so unjust, so unfair, nay, so perverse in his judgment as to render every anthropomorphic expression concerning God in the Old Testament a proof of the low sensual character of the Hebrew faith, as if there were not a hundred times as many passages indicative of the sublimity and spirituality of Jehovah, and to assign to Him whom the heavens and the Heaven's heavens do not contain, 'horns,' because the Hebrew word used for rays in Habbakuk III, 4, is 'horns' (qarnayim). Nay, more, to insinuate that the Israelitish deity was not free from sexual dualism because it is said that "God made man in His image; man and wife He created them." Indeed, we scarcely trust our eyes when we find the laws of Moses, which taught the world righteousness and kindness, declared to be equal and in many respects even inferior to the laws of Hamurabi, the Babylonian King of the time of Abraham, which sanction almost any pagan vice and wickedness in the social and religious life of the people, simply because the warfare against the idolatrous inhabitants of Canaan includes or enjoins a number of inhumanities intended to eradicate the evil. Not even the Decalogue, the foundation of our entire civilization, is treated without aspersions. The whole animus is that of unfairness and impiety. And here alone lies the significance of these lectures. As to the contents, it may well be said of them what Lessing said of a work of his antagonist, "Whatever is true in it is not new, and whatever is new in it is not true." It is the characteristic sign of the time, that any professor or writer in Germany who craves for popularity needs but to blow the horn of anti-Semitism and give vent

to the furor Teutonicus of a Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Paul Lagarde and Steward Chamberlain, and no matter how groundless his theories, he may be sure of finding favor among high and low. If only care be taken that the New Testament, with its slanderous accusation against the Jews as deicides, be left intact, the Old Testament, God and Judaism may be assailed with impunity. How much of the innocent blood that ran through the streets of Kishineff on the last Easter Days may be traced to such German professorial sham science, God alone knows. Surely such lectures, delivered at the Berlin Court on Babel und Bibel, do not lead to peace among the classes and the races. To us Jews, then, these lectures offer a very important lesson. Here is a Semitic philologist who, in order to condemn Judaism as a religious truth, places the Old Testament on a level with the Babylonian civilization denounced by Israel's seers as ungodly and inhuman, and declares the sacred writers to be nothing but imitators and plagiarists without any originality. And what is his starting point? Up to modern times the Old Testament was as holy to the Christian as to the Jew, it being regarded by the former as the divine ground-work or preparatory stage of the New. Modern research, eager everywhere to follow up the sources of things, has with every new discovery in the field of mental as well as of natural science offered the undeniable proofs of the human origin of the Bible and all Mosaic institutions. As under the magic wand of the Assyriologist a world of undreamt of splendor rose from the ruins of Mesopotamia before the amazed gaze of our generation, and every Biblical tale and each Mosaic rite received some new light from the hoary past, the belief in a supernatural origin or in the plenary inspiration of the Bible became for the thinking mind well nigh impossible. It is true, there are orthodox Jews and Christians to whom Assyriology presents no difficult problem whatsoever, because they are of that child-like faith which does not hesitate to take such narratives of the Bible as that regarding the institution of the Sabbath by God at the very creation and the worship of JHVH by Enoch, the grandson of Adam, as indisputable actual occurrences. Such perfect naïveté we respect, but we cannot

regard it as a phase of belief in harmony with our age, which is above all an age of historical consciousness, an age which sees the vestiges of growth and development in everything that falls within human ken.

Now, what is the attitude of the Christian theologian of modern times towards the results of modern investigation, and particularly in the field of Assyriology? When at the close of the eighteenth century, Egypt opened up her hidden treasures of the past to the modern world, the resemblances discovered between the Mosaic laws and the priestly rites of the Egyptians led the first investigators in their rapturous conceit to the assumption that Moses stole his ideas about God and His laws concerning the sanctuary from the priests on the Nile, and even the name Jehovah appeared to them as the work of plagiarism. To-day when the decipherments of the Assyrian and Babylonian monuments have by far eclipsed those made in the Nile Delta, Moses is declared to be indebted for all he taught and instituted to the Babylonian codifiers and priests. All the wider, then, is the gulf made between the Old Testament and the New Testament, between Moses and Jesus, so as to reserve the claim of divinity for the latter, while the former is unhesitatingly sacrificed. This is the main aspect of the situation. "The divine nimbus of the Jewish people is gone," says his Majesty, the Christian Emperor of Germany, without even for a moment considering whether in speaking thus he does not cut off from beneath his feet the very branch of the tree upon which he stands. "Sauve qui peut," is the cry amidst the modern deluge of ideas. The up-to-date Christian theologian cares very little whether the best and loftiest New Testament utterances have been taken over from Jewish sources or not; he worships, says Prof. Delitzsch, the God of Christ, not the God of Abraham. As a Semitic professor who read his Koran, he has words of admiration for such beautiful passages as the one describing how Abraham by searching found God to be the Ruler and Maker of sun, moon and stars, but he needs not have the least notion that these very passages are Agadic illustrations of the rabbis transmitted through Jewish sources to Mohammed. To him Judaism is nothing but a narrow, clannish

particularism. Why should a German professor heed the ancient Mosaic precept which says: "Do no unrighteousness in judgment; just balances and just weights shall ye have?" (Leviticus XIX, 35, 36.)

But then, how about our Judaism? How are we Jewish theologians or laymen, who, following the trend of the time, have learned to see that the whole Biblical system of life and practice has been shaped under the direct or indirect influence of Babylonian culture,—how are we to deal with these great questions of faith; Bible and Revelation, Law and Ceremony, Sabbath and Levitical laws? There is little doubt in my mind that the ultra-conservative training of Friedrich Delitzsch made him a despiser and mocker of the Old Testament. It is a psychological law that naïve orthodoxy, when, on eating of the tree of knowledge, it discovers its own nakedness, is driven far away from its former state of innocence into rebellious belief. I dare say that it is owing to cowardly fear of Bible criticism, and of the modern historical methods of Bible research that Judaism has not produced one Jewish scholar who is the equal of any Christian Bible Exegete of note. This is a bold statement, and I make it without reserve and without fear of contradiction. Should then this deplorable state of things continue and historical Judaism in its various stages of growth find no defender except in the narrow apologetic spirit of the Breslau school or according to the unscientific methods of Samson Raphael Hirsch and his followers?

Only that system of theology which clearly distinguishes between the form and the spirit, between the letter of the law and the underlying idea furnishes us with the weapons necessary to defend Judaism, and finally to render it victorious as a world-historic power. And this system gives also Assyriology its right setting, inasmuch as it furnishes the most valuable key to the understanding of the whole process of growth of the Jewish faith. For evolution is the master key. It casts its light upon all the stages of Judaism, Prophetism, Mosaism and Rabbinism, and while including also the Christian and Mohammedan faith as offshoots of Judaism, it puts the divine stamp of history upon Progressive or Reform Judaism as the one destined to realize the aims

and ideals of the future and leading towards a religion of humanity broad enough to comprise all sects and races. Taking this view, the Reform theologian on opening his Bible is not disturbed by a Biblical cosmogony which has neither an act of creation nor a Creator for the chaos—the *Tehom*—or the primeval darkness—*Hoshek*—and which so operates with the number 'seven' while presenting the successive stages of the creative process of the world, that neither from the point of view of natural science nor with his simple common sense can he accept it as an actuality. Acquaintance with the Babylonian myth at once solves for him the difficulty, while he cannot fail to discern the working of the power of the prophet's spirit in the transformation of the quaint Chaldean story of Creation void of plan and purpose and depicting only quarreling gods and monsters into the sublime, yet simple tale, so full of perennial beauty and poetic truth.

The same is the case with the story of the Flood. It is found in its original crudeness in the Chaldean legend, and many features that remain obscure in the two different versions combined in the Pentateuch chapters appear much more transparent in the Babylonian original. Yet how much grander and loftier have the scenes of the world's devastation become under the influence of monotheistic truth which places God as the Judge and Ruler upon the world's throne high above the surging flood, and turns even the rainbow in the sky into a sign of His covenant of peace with the earth beneath. We have as yet, notwithstanding Delitzsch's assertion to the contrary, not discovered the Chaldean original of the Biblical story of Paradise and the expulsion of man, nor of the Tower of Babel, but we shall presumably some day come across them, and we can with certainty tell beforehand, with reference to fragments preserved of Berosus by Josephus and in the Sibyllines, and other similar myths, that, instead of the lofty view of God and of man as image of God presented by the Bible, a monstrous *Tehom*-like serpent, and giants rising in rebellion against God will be found occupying the chief place there. As a matter of fact, many passages in the Bible show traces of those mythological figures of old Chaldean demons or

monsters—Rahab and Tannin—whom Jehovah has to combat in order to prove victorious over storm and flood. And so we discern, everywhere, the process of evolution at work which makes the spirit of Jewish monotheism seize upon an often incongruous mythological form, to make it expressive of high and beautiful ideas.

At times we are at a loss to decide whether Chaldea or the still older Arabia, as cradle of the Semites, is the mother of certain views and customs; the law of development remains the same in both cases. The name JHVH which Delitzsch rather rashly claims to have been imported from Babylonia, has been with better reasons derived by other inquirers from the Sinaitic peninsula, and there is undeniably a mythological element attached to the original deity of the Hebrew, connecting it with fire and storm, hail, thunder and earthquake and other phenomena of the nature of the desert which proves the Mosaic conception of the same as the God 'Who shall be,' to be an abstract creation. But, however, and, wheresoever, the name JHVH originated, the God of Sinai has nothing in common with either. He is not the creation of Moses. He is at the very start a moral power, and only as such did He appear to Moses and make him a prophet. Each successive generation of prophets aided in sublimating the conception of the Jewish deity which, unlike all Semitic deities, manifested itself from the beginning without relation to sex. In other words, Judaism is at the outset ethical Monotheism, whatever the original Decalogue may, according to Bible critics, have contained. The very simplicity of the patriarchal faith lifted the deity at once above all the impurities and abominations of the cults of Babylon, Egypt and Canaan, and the very term for holiness which these pagan nations lent to the lascivious priests and priestesses of Astarte—Kadesh and Kedesha—was so transformed by the power of the lofty genius of the Jew as to become the expression of the very highest ideal of purity and perfection man is to strive for.

What matters it if the penitential psalms of Babylonia served, as has been said, the psalmists of Judea as models, or if the entire Hebrew poetry or prose literature was influenced by Babylonian rules of rhythm and structure, there

remains a gulf between the inner life of Babel and that of the Bible as wide as between earth and heavens. On the one side there is a dense darkness of superstition spread over all knowledge and science to fill the heart with gloom in spite of all the gleams; on the other there is, notwithstanding the lesser skill and culture, a faith, a hope and a love which brighten and cheer the soul to make it amidst direst woe cry forth, "If I have Thee in heaven, I need nothing on earth!" and amidst humblest contrition, "Create in me a clean heart, O God; a broken and contrite spirit Thou wilt not despise."

Convincing proof has not been brought as yet, but it may be assumed as certain, that the Sabbath, as a day of rest, originated in Babylonia where the seventh, the fourteenth, the twenty-first, and the twenty-eighth day of each month and the nineteenth day of each second month, that is the seven times seventh day of each double month, was a day of perfect cessation from work for the priest-king. On the sacredness of the number seven rested the Mosaic system which declared the seventh day of each week, the seventh month of the year, the seventh year and the half-a-year following the forty-ninth year and ending with the tenth day of the seventh month of the fiftieth year, as Klosterman has shown, as a holy season of rest and release, and it is possible that this view or custom goes back to more remote times of Semitic shepherd life. That the Jewish Sabbath was originally like the Babylonian, a rotatory lunar festival and not the closing day of a fixed week, such as it is in the Mosaic system, that is to say, that in ancient Israel each month consisted of four Sabbaths or lunar cycles with a New Moon festival of two days of which the second day formed the beginning of the new month, may be learned from the fact that the new moon was in pre-exilic times regarded as a greater holiday than the Sabbath, and the announcement of a second New Moon day beforehand by Jonathan (I Sam., XX, 19ff.) can only be explained upon such an assumption. In fact, the Sabbath is nowhere, neither in the Decalogue nor in the Manna story, spoken of as a new institution, and if the creation story proves anything, it is the fact that the Sabbath goes back to remote times

and is, therefore, pictured as instituted by God from the beginning. And yet who can compare the Babylonian Sabbath, which was a day of fear and gloom, a dies nefas, observed only as a day on which no work should be undertaken by king or priest from dread of the unlucky seven stars, with the Jewish Sabbath which was rendered a day of rejoicing and uplifting for the people, for both master and servant, man and beast, a real day of God? It was, moreover, so essentially different from the Chaldean Sabbath that the law expressly declares it to be a sign distinguishing Israel from the surrounding nations. Thus here again the form was Babylonian; the spirit, the underlying idea is altogether Jewish and far above the Babylonian level, and if Delitzsch claims the merit of having granted the great boon of a Sabbath to toiling humanity for Babylon, he knowingly misstates facts.

But the Assyriologist claims still more. Good fortune has brought us during the past year into the possession of the Code of Law which the great conqueror Hamurabi, believed to be the Biblical Amraphel, the contemporary of Abraham, composed for his great empire, and which is a thousand years older than any other code within our knowledge. It affords us an insight into a social order which fairly amazes us by its comprehensiveness. It brings us face to face with a state of culture compared with which Hebrew life may be termed crude and primitive. It fixes by explicit statutes the relations of husband to wife, of parents to children, of master to slave and of employer to employee, and secures protection to every owner of property against any possible injury. Daughters are accorded the right of inheritance, wives their dowry, which is not the case in the Mosaic Code. More than this, domestic life rests on monogamy, though there is no restriction regarding concubines. Is the legislation of Moses by far eclipsed here by the work of the great Napoleon of the fourth pre-Christian Millennium? Thus argues Delitzsch, but in the same fallacious and unfair manner as in all other things. First of all the statement that Hamurabi received his laws from Shamash, the sun-God and heavenly Judge exactly as Moses did his from the God of Sinai rests on an error. Hamurabi is portrayed as

worshiping the sun-God, not as receiving the law from him, which in fact is expressly declared by him to be of his own making. The Babylonian law-giver demands obedience to his will and submission to his authority; the Jewish law-giver demands obedience and reverence for the God who speaks out of His law and Whose humble servant he is. And what is the main idea and essential character of this law of Moses? It is not like Hamurabi's, an iron system of bondage in which the inferior is the slave of the superior, and property regarded as of greater value than human life, in which the most cruel punishments are meted out for the smallest transgression and a man beheaded for stealing a piece of property. Justice is written with letters of fire on every statute, justice for poor and rich alike, for the lowly and the one high in station, one law for stranger and for citizen, and every life sacred; also that of the slave, every human being to be treated with regard, even the criminal.

There are traces of the ancient Babylonian, or what we would call common law in the Mosaic legislation. To this belonged for instance, the ordeal of water prescribed for the woman suspected of adultery. In Hamurabi's code it appears in the form of jumping into the river, the one who escaped drowning being considered as having proved herself guiltless. Such an ordeal was known and practiced also in mediaeval or common Teutonic law. The law of retaliation, "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," carried out to its most extreme and cruel consequences in the Hamurabi Code, was also part of the Hebrew common law and afterwards amended and abrogated by the rabbis. On the other hand, blood-avenging by the kinsman based on ancient Semitic common law, and connected with the idea of asylums or places of divine protection was still in force in ancient Israel, but no longer recognized by Hamurabi's legislation. The patriarchal life of the Hebrews has also been shown to have legal practices in common with the Babylonian Code, as for instance the place Hagar occupies in Sarah's household when giving birth to an heir in her stead. Nevertheless there is little of that deeper sense of justice and righteousness in Babylonian life which forms so prominent a feature in Hebrew law and life. In vain we look in Hamurabi's Code

for that feeling of compassionate love for the needy and distressed, that overflowing sympathy for the widow, the fatherless and homeless, which rendered the law of Moses the Code of Ethics for humanity. Nor does it appear only as the flowering forth of prophetic teaching in Deuteronomy. It is expressed with all the touching pathos of a child-like faith in a merciful God in the older legislation of Exodus, the so-called Book of the Covenant. True, monogamy is not insisted on in the Mosaic Code as in the Babylonian, yet who can read the story of Eve's creation or the Deuteronomic legislation without feeling that in the eyes of the Biblical narrator and law-giver, polygamy is condemned. So does the Deuteronomic law regarding the slave and the position accorded to him in Abraham's household or in Job's view show how much higher the personality of the slave is rated by the Hebrew than the Babylonian. To sum up: Babel was a world without justice and without love and compassion, one void of purity and of truth. The Bible opened for man all the deeper treasures of the soul in giving him a God of righteousness and holiness to emulate and follow in humility.

Nor did the influence of Babylonia end with the Bible or the Hebrew age. Babylonian ideas helped in the formation of Judaism and Christianity to a far greater extent than is generally known. Here Delitzsch is for once right, but he only confirms what the rabbis themselves declare, that the whole list of angels and demons was adopted from Babel. What Delitzsch omitted to do—and this is characteristic enough—is to make his assertion broader and stronger with reference to the New Testament. The driving out of demons, which plays such a great rôle in the New Testament, was one of the many practices adopted by the Essene saints and their successors, the early Christians, from the magic system of Chaldea. It was Babylonian superstition transplanted into Judea, and while the great masters in Israel repudiated such practices in Talmudical and mediæval times, the authorities of the Church without exception encouraged them and built their system on them. Only in mystic lore, in the Cabbala, Babylonian ideas continued as powers inspiring men with fear; the Bible, wherever it

was rendered the basis of faith, cheered the heart with the Creator's words: "Let there be light."

Yes, Babylonia still lives in every superstitious practice, in every astrological or magic belief, in every system of faith based upon the belief in Satanic powers of evil and of darkness; yet over against all such survivals of paganism, against all that which Babel stands for, Jeremiah's words sound forth the scathing cry of condemnation: "Learn not the way of the heathen and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven. There is none like Thee, O Lord; Thou art great and Thy name is great. Thus shall ye say unto them in the language of Babylonia, 'The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth—these shall perish from the earth and from under the heavens.'" This, then, is our answer to all worshipers of Babel and haters of Israel and its Book of Books. Babel is dead and her gods have fallen and all her monuments have crumbled into dust. Israel's God lives and will outlive all His blasphemers. Only let us see to it that we have the men of large vision and lofty spirit, broad-minded and abreast of the age, who stand forth as defenders of our heritage, able to answer the scoffer and the assailant of our faith, because they are equipped with the weapons of knowledge.

WHAT THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE STANDS FOR

AND THE PREREQUISITES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF ITS STUDENTS

WITH the help of the Most High—*בעזרת ה'*—we open today for the forty-second time the doors of the College, welcoming teachers and learners, the professional staff and the student body, the old members and the new-comers, the administrators and the friends of our institution for a new year's work. And I trust that you all, dear boys, come refreshed and reinvigorated in body and mind, and consecrated anew by the spirit of earnestness and devotion for the task. These are serious times. The critical period in the world's history in which we live, by the fierce passions displayed everywhere, has bewildered the minds and hearts of men, and brought confusion and discord in an unprecedented manner also into the ranks of the Jew. This makes it, in my opinion, advisable to state or restate in clear and emphatic language, What the Hebrew Union College stands for and what the requisites and opportunities of its students are. I have selected for my text the closing words of the majestic swan song of Moses, which form the climax of the Blessing with which the great leader took leave from his people: "Blessed art thou, O Israel, who is like unto thee, a people saved by the Lord, the Shield of thy help, who is the Sword of thine excellency, thine enemies cringe before thee, while thou treadest upon their heights."

Taken literally, the verse, of course, refers to Israel as a nation inhabiting the land of promise, replete, as the preceding verse says, with the blessings of soil and sky, and it voices the then highest aspirations of the nation. Naturally the scope and outlook of the great law-giver did not extend beyond the confines of the small territory between the Jordan and the Mediterranean sea. And yet what was this nation for him but the vessel containing elements far sur-

passing the limits of the land and the state. Just as the opening verses of the Blessing point to the Torah, 'the fiery law' which made Israel God's peculiar treasure, the '*Am Segullah*, among the nations of the earth, so do the concluding verses extol Israel as being beyond comparison with any other nation on account of its being forever bound up with Him 'who rideth the heavens in its help,' and whose 'eternal arms' are outstretched to carry it along the ages towards its glorious destination. God is the source of its wondrous strength; His truth the shield of its help and the sword of its excellence. The Torah given to the Congregation of Jacob as inheritance for all times, the ark of the covenant that carried the priest-people across the land and seas and the centuries of history, constitutes its vital element. Its religion is the soul of the nation, the purpose of its existence. With this great message Moses departed from the people he had shaped into a nation, and each generation of prophets, of psalmists and of sages enlarged, deepened and developed this spiritual heritage, until out of the ruins of State and Temple Judaism arose a rejuvenated, religionized Israel. Again the national body became the vessel which was to concentrate the spiritual forces of Jewry with the Synagogue as its center and focus, to render the Torah, the Sabbath and festivals bearers of light, moral and intellectual educators of the world. Through Bible and Synagogue Judaism amidst the dispersion became the promulgator of the world's universal God, the disseminator of its universal truth all over the globe, the mother-religion of the Church and the Mosque, yet ever youthful and vigorous enough to outlive both. Only with reference to its being the world's mightiest spiritual factor can it be said of Israel: "Blessed Israel, who is like unto thee." As the Midrash has it, only on account of the incomparable loftiness of Israel's God, voiced in the song, "Who is like Thee among the gods, O Lord," does Israel outrank all nationalities and creeds to be incomparable. Only on account of the watchword: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord, our God, the Lord is One," which prompted the Jew all through the ages in unparalleled loyalty to offer up life and all it held to testify to the Only One and Holy God, would God reciprocate, saying: "Is there a nation like

unto Israel so unique on earth?" Yes, Judaism, not as a political, nor as a cultural force, which is of no significance in the world's account, but as the greatest religious and spiritual force in history is the soul and substance of Jewish nationality. As a thousand years ago the Gaon Saadia expressed it: Our nation is not a nation by virtue of race or of any political endeavor, but solely by reason of its Torah.

It has been left to the perversity and degeneracy of our generation to proclaim a Jewish nationalism without God and religion, one devoid of the Torah and the Synagogue, and particularly of the mission assigned to Israel on Sinai in the words: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." I can well understand how nominal Jews, those who never set their foot into a Synagogue, nor identified themselves in any way with Judaism and its institutions, and were never interested enough in learning to know anything about our ancestral religion and our wondrous history except perhaps from non-Jewish sources, how such men could all of a sudden, moved by sympathy with the suffering Jew, so realize their blood-relationship as to place themselves into the front rank of those working for the restoration of the nation in a land of their own, to make an end of its terrible woes. They can only take the secular view, since they see in the Jew not God's witness throughout the lands and ages, the chosen instrument of Divine Providence trained through suffering for its sublime task, not 'the servant of the Lord,' 'the man of sorrow' from whose bruises the balm of healing is to flow for all the nations, but simply the innocent lamb hunted and lacerated by blood-thirsty wolves and hyenas, the victims of cruelest intolerance and barbarism, and they find no way for his preservation than by the re-establishment of the Jewish nation, strangely unmindful of the fact that it is just the tide of nationalism which has brought upon us all the horrors and woes of this world-war as well as those of the Russian pogroms. Ignorance and irreligion are at the bottom of the whole movement of political nationalism. But how men who ought to know better, men who have all their life begun and ended each day with the *Shema Yisrael*, men who in the daily

Alenu prayer or in the sublime New Year's and Atonement Day prayers voiced with the congregation Israel's universal hope and world-mission, men who spent their lives in the study of our unique history and literature, how such men could join in the cry for a Judaism secularized, for a Jewish nationalism divorced from God, denuded of religion and divested of Israel's diadem of the Torah and its priestly mission, and make common cause with declared unbelievers *Koferim be-Ikkar*—this is beyond my comprehension. With Joshua, then, I say today to you, my young friends who are here to prepare for the Jewish ministry: "Choose ye this day whom you are to serve: a Jewish nationalism without God, or a Judaism inseparably linked to its universal God, its Torah and its world-mission." Ever since this College was called into existence by its immortal founder, Dr. Wise, it stands unfalteringly and uncompromisingly for Judaism, for Reform Judaism, for Progressive American Judaism.

First of all, then, for Judaism solely and simply. In all essentials there is but one Judaism. The God of the patriarchs, the God of the prophets and psalmists, the God of the Talmudic sages and mediaeval thinkers is the God we teach, whose ways we endeavor to understand and follow, and to whose throne of mercy we send up our prayers. There is no difference here between Orthodoxy and Reform, between the conservative and liberal Jew. Philosophy and science could at all times only confirm, deepen and sublimate, but never displace the God of Revelation. Neither pantheism nor pluralism could ever undermine or even disturb the pure monotheistic belief, nor will they today. Israel's God never became a mere abstraction, a God of the intellect only, who does not enter into personal relation with man either in prayer, or in his faith and trust in an all-ruling Providence. Judaism's God is a living God, not the Bergsonian God who is never finished, nor like the Christian God who leaves the care of man to a subaltern man-god to deal out salvation or doom according to one's belief. There is no God like our God, so sublime, high above all limitations of space and time, and yet so near to each human soul as to admit no mediation or intercession of either divine or human beings. Nor is there any system of belief like ours that has a continuity of well-

nigh four thousand years, growing ever deeper, brighter and loftier, and has never paled or wavered before other creeds or doctrines of the day, whether dualistic or trinitarian, pantheistic or atheistic. Israel's nation with its state and temple fell like other nations; but Israel's God has become the God of history, the God of humanity, and His unity has unified the cosmos and made mankind one in all ethical and social principles and ideals. And before this unity all divisions of men into classes and sects, into believers that are saved and unbelievers that are damned before the judgment throne of heaven must ultimately vanish. This is the hope and conviction of every Jew who derives his faith from our common heritage. While unlocking here for our study the priceless treasures deposited in our great literature and library, we are at one with our fathers, with the faithful Jews of all the lands and ages, exclaiming with Moses: "Blessed art thou, O Israel, who is like unto thee?"

But the Judaism taught here is characterized by the name of Reform Judaism. This does not mean, as so many think and assume, a reformation of the ancient faith such as was brought about by Luther, Calvin and Wesley, when they created a new religion in place of the old Catholic Church. The name Reform simply expresses the great principle of progress, of growth and transformation that has been at work throughout the history of Judaism, but was not recognized until our days of critical and historical research. Orthodoxy rests upon the assumption that the Mosaic law, whether written or oral, emanating from God, must be regarded as immutable as God is. I shall not investigate here whether in his heart of hearts the conservative Jew believes in the whole sacrificial, hierarchical, judicial and social system of the Mosaic law, or in the resurrection of the dead which is more or less connected with the Messianic promises for the holy land. He prays for the restoration of the Jewish Temple and State, because the whole Mosaic law must be re-established in order to bring back God's majesty, the Shekinah, to the now desolate Mount Zion. We cannot conscientiously pray for all this, because we no longer believe in the sacrificial cult nor in resurrection. We have learned from our great prophets to behold in Judaism

and its Messianic hope a universal truth and universal hope, a religion of righteousness for all men, and not of ritualism. Moreover, on closer investigation of all the sources we have come to recognize the important fact that the whole of Judaism, its ceremonies and its doctrines, are the product of a continuous process of transformation and growth, and that owing to the changes of time and environment they were constantly subject to change and reform, however unconsciously made. Yet here was the basis found for all our modern reform measures and methods, consciously applied by us in accordance with the needs and demands of our age and of each land within modern civilization. But this necessitates a re-interpretation of our whole past, a reconstruction of our Biblical and Talmudic literature upon the principle of historical progress, and a thorough investigation of all the forces and influences at work in the various periods of history and phases of culture with the view of ascertaining what is essential and permanent, and what merely formal and transient in Judaism. This, of course, requires years of diligent study to obtain the right historical view and the Jewish world-view, and likewise the right religious or spiritual aspect for our day. For, after all, we are but like a dwarf standing upon the shoulder of a giant in regard to our great past. We must build upon its solid foundation while taking cognizance of the demands of our time to render Judaism a living faith. And who can deny that Reform Judaism has everywhere in Synagogue and home regenerated the ancient faith which had become petrified in its codes of law, and that it has imbued the soul of the modern Jew with new love and enthusiasm for his ancestral religion? As a matter of fact our conservative brethren have everywhere adopted many of the leading features of the very Reform Service they denounce, in order to win the Jewish woman and child for the ancient faith. Reform Judaism is not a departure from, but a pioneer of progress for, Judaism. It has no other object but the revitalization of the ancestral religion, and instead of having ended its career and fulfilled its purpose, it is constantly making new efforts towards rekindling the ancient fire upon the new altar.

And here I come to speak of the third principle for which

our College stands, and that is American Judaism. American Judaism is by its very nature progressive and broad, as are the American people. The democratic spirit of America democratized our Synagogue which opened its main halls with their pews to man, woman and child alike, and invited the non-Jew to sit alongside of the Jew to participate in a divine service made intelligible and accessible in language and form to all. It was the spirit of progress and independence and of prophetic universalism, voiced by our Reform leaders in accord with the spirit of this land of liberty and broad humanity, that attracted the practical common-sense American Jew to the Synagogue, from which many of the so-called enlightened Jews in Europe have become estranged. It will ever redound to the credit and glory of Isaac M. Wise that he made the Americanization of the Jew and Judaism the chief task of his life. Comparing our Synagogue, our religious, educational and philanthropic institutions with those of Europe or the East, ought we not to exclaim: "Blessed art thou, American Israel, who is like unto thee?" Here as nowhere else is the Jew respected and Judaism recognized as the equal of any other citizen or sect. Our Synagogues and Social Centers have become potent forces for social righteousness, for the economic readjustment of life, for peace and harmony between the classes and the masses, because our pulpits deal with the living issues and problems of the day as well as with the eternal verities of religion. It is the Jew and Judaism of America that today wield the greatest influence upon the world, and they will, when this terrible war will once be over, be in the best possible condition to work for the emancipation, civic, social and religious, of our coreligionists in the lands in which they are still persecuted and outlawed. Here, if anywhere, can Israel's great world-mission be carried out with power and success. Indeed, to the American Jew our brethren abroad look for help, inspiration and hope for the future; not Palestine, the land dear and holy to us all for its glorious memories, but this land of promise for man and humanity with its mighty future is the land of our hope.

These are the views and aims, the principles, and leading ideas for which the Hebrew Union College stands. And

again I say to you: Choose ye this day whom you will serve. A dead past or a living future? A utopian fancy or a world-conquering, inspiring ideal?

We want men of strong convictions, not half-hearted souls, men that halt between two opinions. You know the story of Haran, the brother of Abraham. He did not know whether it was wiser to bow to the idols of Nimrod or to go through the fiery furnace like his brother, and as he hesitated and wavered, the half-hearted youth was seized by the flames and consumed. We want men of character who do not sell their birthright for a mess of pottage. We want men of sincerity, of earnestness, of zeal and devotion, ready to bring sacrifice for the cause, not calculating as to a lucrative profession or position. We want men worthy to be priests of God without blemish, men who will stand forth as exemplars of virtue, of integrity and purity in the congregation in which they serve. The first lesson which Moses received when initiated into his great task as leader was that of reverence. "Take off thy shoes from thy feet, for the place on which thou standest is holy," said God to him. All our students, from the youngest to the oldest, must learn the lesson of reverence ever anew: reverence before God, reverence for the teacher, reverence for the house of God and for the Torah. "To treat the Torah like any other book without beholding the divine spirit working in it is to rob oneself of the hallowing influences that give man his nobility." And last but not least, we expect of all of you loyalty, loyalty to your Alma Mater, loyalty to your duty as students of the College.

Watch zealously over the honor of the College, its teachers and its teachings as well as of your fellow-students. See to the health of your mental as well as your physical state. Have you any doubts creeping into your heart? Come with confidence to your teachers. Come to me for help and advice. To doubt is no sin. Kohelet and Job were doubters, too, but they wrestled, until a peaceful solution was found. Remain not in a state of doubt. Leaven and honey, that is substances in a state of dissolution, are not offerings to be brought to God.

Having thus warned you against foibles and faults, let

me say to you all: Blessed are you, the young men called, as I hope all feel, to become spokesmen of what is the highest and the best in man. Who is like unto you in the opportunity of doing good and spreading light and blessing, of bringing peace and comfort to men? Surely you are blessed, if you but think of the students in other theological schools or in other countries. You have all the facilities to unfold your individuality to the best advantage. Your professors are your friends, ever ready to assist you, and so are the members of the Board. You have a fine working library and a model librarian at your side to help you along in your studies. Life is made easy for you and everything round about you is of a nature to encourage you, however arduous your task may be. Well, then, as from the festival of the water-libation of Sukkot comes the call to you: Draw the waters of life with joy from the wells of salvation, the fountain of truth, opened here for you under the blessing of God. Amen.

THE SPIRIT OF GOD

YOU are greatly privileged, my dear boys, in being ordained as Rabbis today under such auspices and powers of inspiration as come but rarely to the graduating youth. After years of noble effort in preparing for the sacred task of teachers and leaders in Israel, you are being crowned with the diadem of the Torah amidst the blessings and congratulations of this large assembly of eminent leaders and representatives of Congregations who have come to pay homage to the memory of the founder of the Hebrew Union College, the prophetic genius and master-builder of American Judaism, whose great personality has just been brought home to us in stirring eloquence by the honored alumnus of the College who has come from the far West to bring us the message of this great historical occasion. In addressing you at this momentous hour there is suggested to me the well-known Scriptural verse which seems to me to voice the lofty thoughts and sentiments that permeate us all: "This is My covenant with them, saith the Lord, My Spirit that is upon thee and My words which I put in thy mouth; they shall not depart out of thy mouth nor out of the mouth of thy children and children's children from now on and forever." Such is the divine behest which inspired the immortal founder of the College, and which has achieved all that we are today so proud of and so thankful for.

Vividly do I here recall the last sermon I heard by Dr. Wise, preached by him, the octogenarian, in Atlantic City from the text: "I shall not die but live, and relate the works of the Lord." His grand theme was Israel's wondrous history, and he said: Nature is full of miracles, and much more so is history, but the greatest of all miracles is the history of the Jew. He outlived all his oppressors and persecutors and is sure to outlive them all, having been endowed by the eternal God with the power of immortality. But here let me ask, wherein lies the secret of this great

miracle, the enigma of human history? and I answer with my text: "My spirit which is upon thee"

Greek mythology tells of Tithonos, the son of a goddess, for whom the mother invoked the gods to bestow on him eternal life, but she forgot to ask also for eternal youth, and behold, with the coming years and ages he withered and dwindled away to become a pitiable, tiny creature. Thousands of years ago the Jew started on his career when Egypt and Babylon stood at their zenith. They and all the empires that followed them have since gone down as they had risen. The Jew is not merely alive today, but competes with the youngest of peoples in youthful vigor and mentality. The Spirit of constant rejuvenation at every period of history achieved the great wonder for him. The spirit of the ever-living God shaped and reshaped the words, the forms and ideas of Judaism, ever to give them a new meaning and value. It entered the dry bones of the people in the Babylonian captivity to make them rise to new life, nay, to greater power and influence than ever before. So did the spiritual life of the Synagogue by far eclipse Temple and State. The religious genius of the Jew manifested itself in the seers, the singers and sages, the lofty thinkers and teachers of all the coming ages, until the modern time witnessed anew the miracle of Judaism's resurrection. When the on-rushing tide of the new life and new thought threatened to undermine the ancient faith and sweep off its very foundations all that was dear and sacred to the Jew, our Reform pioneers felt the working of the divine spirit impelling them to regenerate the ancestral heritage. Out of the narrow and corroding Ghetto walls Jew and Judaism stepped forth with new hope and courage, inscribing freedom and progress upon their banner, and in full accord with the cultural view of the new era they entered upon the prophetic mission to encompass and conquer the world for Israel's Only One.

And among these men of genius and prophetic vision who aroused the proud self-consciousness in the modern Jew, Isaac M. Wise stands out today, admired and extolled throughout the land as the great organizer of American Judaism, and in mighty resonance we hear him, as it were,

utter forth the words: "I shall not die but live, and relate the works of the Lord" Different from his great compeers who were called to America as finished theologians and famous scholars, Dr. Wise came to this land of freedom following the impulse of his soul as a man of the people, and the Spirit of God carried him along from stage to stage, until, equipped with all the powers that make for success, he achieved his great providential task of making America the home of a free, broad and cosmopolitan Judaism. The spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and fear of God spurred him on to travel throughout the length and breadth of the land and prepare the congregations for his plan of consolidating progressive American Jewry in the Union, and then rearing on its firm foundations the Hebrew Union College as its spiritual center. And this spirit he imparted to his disciples who, with a new concept of the Rabbi's calling and with individual forces and aspirations of their own, so enlarged the scope of American Judaism, religiously, educationally and socially, as to render it everywhere a powerful influence commanding the respect and admiration of Jew and non-Jew.

The number of our College graduates has doubled since the death of the master. The College itself, representative of the best Jewish learning, had its administrative system greatly improved under the presidency of our never-to-be-forgotten Edward L. Heinsheimer, and now under the consecration of the Wise Centenary its future is being established upon a basis which bids fair to make it a monument to last for generations to come.

All the more do we need today the spirit to make American Judaism achieve the greater tasks before it and solve the larger problems that confront it. Let us not forget that it is still in its initiative stage, and therefore little understood by the new generation. We all feel that religion must above all be life, and life has grown larger and more multiform on all sides. The congregation has become a part of the larger community, and the communities are fast outgrowing their local and traditional religious confines to broaden out into humanitarian spheres of activity. We are entering amidst

severe crises and trials, upon a new era in history. We are but in the first stage of the victory of American idealism which is to secure forever the triumph of those principles of justice, liberty and humanity first proclaimed by Israel's prophets of yore, and usher in the era of peace for the wide world. The higher power of the spirit must interlink and overawe the peoples. Religion alone, which touches the deep recesses of the heart and brings God, the Father of mankind, nigh to every soul, can bind the nations in a covenant which is to outlast time and circumstances. And here will come the great opportunity for American Judaism. Just as American Jewry, for its prosperity and power as well as for its large-heartedness, is looked upon by the Jews all over the globe as the God-appointed defender of their rights and protector of their interests in international life, so is American Judaism to become a leading force in the council of religions, to appeal to the innermost core of the divine truth and the idealistic spirit which is in all, and thus help in rebuilding a disrupted world. "Not by power, nor by might, but by My spirit, saith the Lord."

And this is also my message for you, my dear young friends and pupils. As American Rabbis you are to embody in your life Israel's everlasting priesthood. And there comes to you the divine promise: This is My covenant sealed by My spirit that is upon thee, and by My words which I put into thy mouth to render them living truths for each soul that thirsts after righteousness, and for every heart that craves for comfort and strength. High is the aim, manifold and arduous the task of the modern Rabbi. Be prepared for hardships, for severe tests of your character. It is the school of life which will probe your manhood, and your principles. So let the spirit of our peerless heroes, seers and sages ever guide and direct your path, and measure your powers and your achievements wherever you are by the high standard set up by our immortal teachers and masters. Quite naturally you differ in your dispositions, aims and ideals, as indeed you have been accorded perfect freedom regarding your individual concepts of our traditional beliefs and customs. But let the spirit of our ancient faith ever unite you in preaching and teaching God's words as the

fruitage of the tree of life for old and young, for congregation or individual, for Jew and non-Jew. You have had valuable practical experience in pulpit and social work. Serve always unselfishly and devoutly in the cause of God and humanity. Beware of the sins of those young priests in Aaron's house who offered 'a strange fire' upon the altar of God and were consumed. Do not indulge in fads and fashionable watchwords of the day which befog and bewilder the minds, but let the fire of heaven kindle every soul among your hearers that, as in Elijah's days, the doubters and deniers may sink upon their knees and cry forth "The Lord is our God. The Lord is our God!" Inspire those that come within your reach with reverence and awe for everything holy and lofty, so that all be impressed with the dignity of your calling as 'the messengers of the Lord of hosts,' and thus be lifted to a higher ideal of life. Be men and of large sympathies and broad views and yet firm in your principles, while working for the promotion of all the interests and the common cause of Israel.

Come up, then, to receive with my blessings and the blessings of the Faculty and the Board of Governors as token of your Ordination the diploma which entitles you to all the rights, privileges and honors of the Rabbi.

ZIONISM

ALTHOUGH a determined opponent of the Zionist movement ever since it began, I would not call myself Anti-Zionist. My views are positive, not merely negative. We have all been taught that westward the course of empire takes its way, as does the journey of the sun and the stars. The Zionist wants us to turn our face again to the East. As far as this means retrogression, we oppose it. But will not Occident and Orient some day clasp hands? Zion is to the Jew the symbol of this glorious hope. Whether conservative or liberal, orthodox or progressive, whether waiting for the advent of the royal son of David to rally the dispersed sons of Judah and rebuild State and Temple after the pattern which Moses received from God on Sinai, or looking for the fulfillment of the Messianic hope in more comprehensive and ideal manner and in greater accord with the law of human progress and evolution, the Jews can not but behold in Zion the sublime goal of history, the rallying-point of the nations for peace and for brotherhood, the end of all strife, the culmination of all human endeavor, the realization of mankind's fondest and loftiest ideals. Ever since the great seer of Jerusalem first portrayed in wondrous colors the golden age to dawn for mankind under the reign of the son of Jesse, and the prophet of the Exile spelled forth the magic name of the Golden City of Righteousness and Concord for the wide globe, Zion has been the treasury of comfort and inspiration alike for Jew and Christian. But more than to the Christian, whose faith is 'otherworldliness,' and whose Jerusalem is the city of the King of Heaven, was Zion to the oppressed and persecuted Jew. It was his only hope and source of strength. When he welcomed the Sabbath bride, or recited his daily prayers, when he built a new home, or suffered a great loss in his family circle, the remembrance of Zion hallowed his joy and his grief. His whole life was centered on Jerusalem. No lover ever sang the praise of his beloved with such ardor as the great mouthpiece of mediæ-

val Judaism, the inspired bard, Jehuda Halevi, did that of his love, Jerusalem. Not on the streams of Babylon or Spain only, but in all lands and ages, the Jew, with ashes strewn on his head, clad in mourning, wept and prayed for Jerusalem. Who dares say that this was a mere dream and illusion? The hope for Zion was the soul and life-blood of the Jew. For it he willingly suffered and sacrificed everything. It embodies his faith, his law, his truth, every idea and principle he lived for.

Is it the realization of this glorious hope of Israel that the Herzls and the Nordaus and the whole band of Zionists stand and work for? Do they come in the name of Israel's God, in the name of Israel's holiest truth, with the message from Him who redeemed and shielded us all these thousands of years, that we should hail them as workers of divine salvation? There is nothing religious, nothing lofty and spiritual about the whole scheme. Their very use of the name of Zion is a profanation and an abuse. "We have long enough looked up to heaven following the course of the stars, while all the nations around grasped parts of the earth; it is time for us, too, to abandon the world of ideals, and take possession of the earth." Thus said Bismarck's clever disciple, Herr von Buelow, in the German Reichstag while defending Germany's invasion of China. The same policy of Nineteenth Century realism Dr. Herzl proposed to the Jew, and his words found resonance in thousands of hearts. The question now is whether we, the People of the Book, the people that for 3,500 years stood for the world of ideals, can afford to sacrifice our past, to sell our birthright, for a piece of land.

Zionism expects the Jews to go back to Judea, and purchase the land, not simply for purposes of colonization, but for the sake of establishing a Jewish commonwealth. The movement is a combination of two currents, the one having as its aim the colonization of Palestine, working for the past forty years successfully in starting twenty or more farming settlements in that country, perhaps following an impulse given by George Eliot's Daniel Deronda, which fired some eastern men, to start, under the name of 'Lovers of Zion' an emigration from Russia at the time of the first

persecutions begun under Czar Alexander III. The other and more recent movement was started by Dr. Herzl, who in his pamphlet, 'The Jewish State,' proposed the solution of the great Jewish question by the purchase of land, without regard to locality, for the sake of giving the Jews political independence; also with a view of making it a sort of socialistic community, providing for seven hours' labor per day, and inculcating other socialistic ideas. When he saw that his project was too utopian, he united it with that of the 'Lovers of Zion,' and called a convention of Zionists, to be held at Munich, August 1, 1898. Meeting with fierce opposition, however, from all the rabbis and the leading Jews in England and Germany—I may say of all Europe—he saw that the only way of success for his congress was to transfer its place of meeting to Basle, and it was there held on the last day of August, 1898. There the many protests made, and the many warnings given, induced the congress to drop the term 'Jewish State,' and, instead, a legally and publicly established Home for the Jews was adopted as the aim and object of the Congress.

Now, the very fact that a home should be provided for the Jews implies the idea, wholly erroneous, that the Jews living in the various countries of occidental civilization still look to Palestine as their home—a sentiment refuted and resented by nearly every Jewish citizen in England or America, France or Germany. Even the orthodox Jew, who prays for the restoration of the Jewish kingdom, cannot accept this movement as the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecy, which must come by the supernatural intercession of Divine Providence.

It is contended by the Zionists that we Reform Jews who no longer pray for the national restoration of Israel, have no right to antagonize a movement with which the millions of orthodox Jews throughout the world are naturally in full sympathy. This is utterly false. Let me quote the latest authority of conservative Judaism, Dr. M. Friedlander, of London. In his work, *The Jewish Religion*, p. 161-2, he writes with reference to the Twelfth Article of the Jewish Creed: "The hopes with which our religion inspires us, can never lead us to intrigues, political combinations, insurrec-

tion or warfare for the purpose of regaining Palestine and appointing a Jewish government. On the contrary, our religion teaches us to seek the welfare of those nations in whose midst we live, and to conscientiously take part in the work for their national progress and prosperity, whilst patiently waiting for the miraculous fulfillment of the prophecies. Even if a band of adventurers—this was written in 1892—were to succeed in reconquering Palestine for the Jews by means of arms, or reacquiring the Holy Land by purchasing it from the present owners, we should not see in such an event the consummation of our hopes.”

Here is part of a letter which Abraham de Cologne, grand rabbi of Paris, wrote in 1825 to the *Journal des Debats* with reference to the proclamation of Mordecai M. Noah, ordering the reassembling of the scattered remnants of Israel for the restoration of a Jewish State in the city of Ararat, North America:

“Messrs. Herschel and Meldola, chief rabbis at London, and myself thank him, but positively refuse the appointments (as *chargés d'affaires* and *commissionaires d'emigration*) he has been pleased to confer upon us. We declare that according to our dogmas God alone knows the epoch of the Israelitish restoration! that He alone will make it known to the whole universe by signs entirely unequivocal; and that every attempt on our part to reassemble with any political-national design is forbidden as an act of high treason against the Divine Majesty. Mr. Noah has doubtless forgotten that the Israelites, faithful to the principles of their belief, are too much attached to the countries where they dwell, and devoted to the governments under which they enjoy liberty and protection, not to treat as a mere jest the chimerical consulate of a pseudo-restorer. As, however, justice requires some consideration of the absent, we should be sorry to refuse him the title of a visionary of good intentions.”

Indeed, to go back to the sources of the Rabbinical utterances on this point, let me single out to you one of the most beautiful passages of the Talmud. It reads: “God administered an oath to the people of Israel that they should never forestall or overhasten the time of redemption before He in His wisdom would in His own time and in His own

way mature His plan, but they should remain submissive and loyal to the worldly power to which they are at the time being subjected."

Indeed, this oath of fealty to the nations, enjoining patriotism upon the Jew at all times and under every condition, even in direst oppression, was his mainstay and safeguard, exactly as was the word of Jeremiah: "Seek ye the peace of the city in whose peace your peace shall be secure," or like the maxim of Samuel, the Jewish master in Babylonia: "The law of the government is divine law."

And this is exactly the position which every truly conservative rabbi or layman should, and in fact does, take towards the Zionist scheme of acquiring the Holy Land by purchase; aside from the fact that the possession of Palestine by the Israelites would impose on them from an orthodox point of view, obligations most difficult to fulfill. These are all the sacrificial, the purificatory, the agricultural and the juridic statutes of the Mosaic law, which must then be observed to the letter, and only the frivolous can trifle with any of these, not the serious-minded orthodox Jew. He requires a divine authority, a divine oracle, a power vested only in the Messiah and his forerunner, Elijah, the prophet, to grant dispensation from these. Is, then, Dr. Herzl to be the Messiah and Dr. Nordau his prophet? So much for the orthodox.

As far as we are concerned, who believe in progressive Judaism, we, Occidental Jews, protest as one man against the very idea of a return to Judea, as if that were our land and we but foreigners, aliens and exiles in the country in which we live. The advocates of Zionism misunderstand or misrepresent us altogether, if they charge us with fear, and say that only from mere dread of anti-Semitic hatred do we disavow the belief in our national restoration. No. We resent this very insinuation as an insult and a slander. While we love Judea as the land where the cradle of our ancestors stood, and where the great prophets spoke and the holy psalmists sung, we cling with every fibre of our heart to the land of our birth and citizenship. No persecution, no *Judenhetze*, no mob-cry: "Mort aux Juifs!" could, or ever will, alienate the German Jew from his fatherland, or the

French Jew from his beloved France. Only the expatriated subjects of the Czar and the maltreated Roumanian Jew might be found willing to leave their country, because in actuality they have none. Perhaps there are other Jews in Eastern lands who never were permitted to know what patriotism meant, and are, therefore in search of a fatherland. We have been too long identified with Western civilization to regard the Sultan of Turkey as our redeemer and sovereign.

But the main reason for our most strenuous opposition to Zionism is that we deny the very fact that we are still a nation in the political sense. Judaism is a religious truth entrusted to a nation destined to interlink all nations and sects, classes and races of men. It is a historical mission, not a national life. "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation!" are the words that form the preamble of our constitution, made on Sinai the day when we were cradled as a nation. And since the Jewish State twice proved a failure, Providence decreed that we should cease to be a political power, and work only as a cosmopolitan factor of humanity. To toil and battle throughout all the ages of history for the Unity of God and the unity of mankind is the sole object of our being, our religious truth the purpose of our dispersion over the globe, as the ancient rabbis say. What Church and Mosque attempted but failed to achieve—the union of the human family,—the Jew as an inter-national and inter-denominational factor of cosmopolitan humanity is destined to bring about, notwithstanding all hatred and prejudice. Our mission is not only spiritual or religious in character; it is social and intellectual as well. Therefore, the Jewish question is a puzzle to both Jew and Gentile. "Ye are My witnesses," saith the Lord—that is: Martyrs in the cause of truth and justice and peace until the Lord will be One and the world One. This is true Zionism. This is the hope of Zion, the return, not of the Jew only, but of man to his spiritual heritage.

The fact is that the Jewish spirit never was bound to the soil of Judaea. Universality is essential to the making of the Jew. The best parts of the Bible from the Decalogue to the Psalms and the Prophets were written outside of Palestine.

The highest philosophy of the Jew points to Greek and Arabian culture. Judaism is cosmopolitan. Under the influence of other civilizations and in contact with other nations, it grew broad and world-embracing; in the narrow confines of Judaea it became narrow and exclusive, and so did the Jew. Israel is the leaven of mankind, the salt of the earth. He requires a wide world to expand and to spread his blessing. "But," say you "There will never be assimilation of the Jew with the rest. He will not mingle, nor be allowed to amalgamate, and so hatred and jealousy will abide forever." Assimilation? Absorption? Perish the thought! "Behold a nation that dwells in solitude!" said Balaam, thousands of years ago. Judaism is to run like a Gulf Stream, through the ages of history, never mingling its waters with the rest, until the ocean of humanity is reached, the time when truth and justice cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

The fact that the Jews fail to be recognized as equals even in enlightened countries, and suffer from ostracism or anti-Semitism, is certainly no reason for us to declare ourselves as foreigners and aliens, as the Zionists wittingly or unwittingly do. Dr. Stoecker in Germany, Lueger, in Austria, and Drumont in France hail the Zionist movement with joy. It fully coincides with their conception of the Jew. They want him to return to Palestine, and vacate the present field of activity for the Aryans. But the duty of the Jew is to fight for his rights as a citizen, for his full privileges as man, and though he suffer and be bruised and wounded in the battle, his struggles and trials must end in the final victory of the cause of truth and justice for which he stands.

What a bewildering influence Zionism exerts on the mind, is best shown by the strange fact that even venerable rabbis and leaders of Judaism, in order to defend their Zionistic view, do not shrink from saying: "We have no mission." This was first said by Dr. Herzl, who never in his life identified himself with Judaism. It was made the starting point of Zionism at the Basle Congress, when Dr. Lippe of Roumania said in his opening address: "The Jews would look upon his majesty the Sultan as the Messiah. The Jews had their mission fulfilled when they gave to other peoples the pure

form of worshipping God, the highest moral law and the hymns they sung. They could, therefore, now go back to their own land." Is this not an unconditional surrender to Mohammedanism or Christianity? If we have no mission, then our fathers were more than fools, and the precious blood with which the Shema Israel was sealed, flowed to no purpose! The Jew who suffers for his conviction is not at all as unfortunate as Dr. Nordau and his followers picture him. The Jew of old willingly suffered and died for his faith, because he knew that the cause for which he gave his life would win in the end. Anti-Semitism burns so deeply into our flesh today, because the modern Jew has unlearned the nobility of martyrdom. His 'moral misery' is so great, because he has no longer a grand truth worth suffering for. Dr. Felsenthal, the Zionist, is certainly right when saying "anti-Semitism is immortal." So said our ancient masters: "Amalek dies not," but they added, what he omits: "Therefore, until God's throne of truth is established all over the earth, the Jew's task is not accomplished." He must battle for right and truth, for conscience and conviction. To retreat before the anti-Semite, and leave the field to the foe, as the Zionist advises us to do, is nothing less than cowardice.

No. We repudiate the idea that Judea is the home of the Jew, which unhomes the Jew all over the wide earth. We shall remain citizens of America, on American soil; of France, on French soil, and of Germany, on German soil, and while fighting for our rights and our liberty, we fight for the cause of the larger justice and larger humanity. This is our duty, and it is anything but brave to shirk it, even if it be at times annoying and difficult.

But I hear you say: "This is all theory. We have stern, stolid facts to deal with. Here are five millions of Jews in Russia exposed to unbearable hardship, and threatened with starvation and ruin. Better death than the cruel fate they have to endure. There are the Jews of Galicia and Roumania, of Persia, of Algiers, and Morocco. Will all your preaching on the mission of Israel, all your theology about the Jews as the suffering Messiah of the nations, improve their wretched condition and afford them any relief or even sympathy and comfort in their awful misery? They want

bread to live on, air to breathe, the very first necessities of human existence!"

Here again the very name of Zionism is misleading and fraught with evil. Suppose the land of Palestine could be bought and the ten million pounds of sterling could be obtained for the purpose of procuring 'a legally and publicly assured home for the Jews,' would this really offer the needed relief to the five millions of Russian Jews, to the two millions of Galician Jews, to all the Jews that fret and chafe under the yoke of tyranny or the bitterness of mob violence? Palestine can not hold half, and scarcely the third part of the Jews. The larger part then must needs stay away; the more gifted ones will always stay away. Is, then, the Jewish State to be erected by the poor Russian refugee? Or will the rich Jews of London, Paris and New York take their residence in Jerusalem?

Remember that I do not speak as yet of the plan of a simple and gradual colonization of Palestine, but on Zionism, which pretends to reclaim Judaea for the Jew. It is political Zionism as advocated by Dr. Herzl and Nordau that I condemn. "When we consider that there are nine millions of Jews and assume the colonization movement could settle 10,000 Jews a year in Palestine, it would take 900 years to solve the Jewish Question," said Dr. Herzl in his Basle Congress address. Consequently he wishes 'to steal a march on the Messiah,' as was wittily said, and with one bold stroke solve the question, which becomes so vexatious to Divine Providence, by negotiating with the Sultan for a home, a place of rest for the wandering Jew. What is this but a Utopian dream, a will o' the wisp, to lure thousands into unsafe conditions where they are sure to sink?

1. Never will Russia and France or any of the great powers of Christendom concede the Holy Land to the Jew, even if Turkey would.

2. Neither would the hot temperature of Palestine any longer offer a congenial and healthy soil to the Jew coming from a Northern clime.

3. From a commercial point of view, Palestine, with its meagre facilities for navigation, certainly has poor prospects of ever becoming a leading state, to attract Jewish capital.

Hence farmers alone would have a chance of success in that country. The poor Russian Jews, without a country of their own, might feel induced to go there. The Jews representing occidental culture and enlightenment, the wealthy classes, will never take a permanent residence in such a Jewish state. Consequently, it would simply be the dumping-ground for the unfortunate, the poor and the less cultured. It would never help to lift the standard of Jewish life and thought. The spiritual and the religious mission of the Jew would never be fulfilled by the creation of a Jewish State.

4. Still greater difficulties are presented by the incongruous elements of which a Jewish state, such as is here contemplated, would be composed. Even now the few thousands of Portuguese, German and Polish Jews gathered together in Jerusalem, can not agree. Strife and discord are the perpetual features of their social and religious life there. Nay, even the Zionists among themselves cannot agree, as the London, Berlin, Vienna and New York reports tell. How then will the many varieties and types of Jews blend harmoniously into one great commonwealth, when brought together from the various ends of the globe? Cohesiveness, co-ordination and subordination never were characteristic traits of the Jew. Twice the Jew endeavored to build a powerful state and failed, owing to dissension and discord. Can he expect to be more successful now, after a history of two thousand years has shattered this unity of political, social and religious life, and developed a diversity of character and culture, of language, habits and views as wide as ever existed between the different nations on earth?

5. Assuming, however, that all these obstacles could be finally overcome, that in the very language and literature of Holy Writ the means were given of building up a State so pervaded by the spirit of tolerance and humanity as not only to counteract Asiatic influence and Oriental fanaticism, but also to hold the sanctuaries of other creeds in its keeping, while at the same time true and loyal to the spirit of the Mosaic Law; will this petty commonwealth successfully cope with the hostile forces that now alarm us? Will the erection of a Jewish State defeat or decrease the much-dreaded power of anti-Semitism? Let history answer. Anti-Semitism

originated in Alexandria at the very time when Judea was a fairly respected kingdom, and the Jews had a right to be proud of their holy city. The very success of the Jews as men of commerce and industry, their financial prominence, roused the jealousy of the Greeks, and King Agrippa himself, though imbued more with Hellenic than Jewish culture, did not escape the sneers and scoffs of the Alexandrian mob. Yes, Jew-baiting is an old experience of ours, and a thousand Herzls and Nordaus will not quench it. Whenever the Jew is on the point of losing sight of his mission, anti-Semitism comes as a whip in the hand of Providence to lash him into a consciousness of his duty to God and mankind.

The Jew is by nature and by history cosmopolitan. Whenever a wave of cosmopolitan humanity swept over the world, the Jew felt in accord and sympathy with the nations, and so did the nations with him. The narrow current of nationalism which prevails today, brought the Jew into the false light in which anti-Semitism sees him, but he stands for a humanity, for a religion, for a justice and truth broader than state and church, and for this the true Jew, not the visionary Zionist, will fight to the end.

There is, however, another side of Zionism which we all heartily endorse. As I said at the outset, the efforts made on behalf of the colonization of Palestine by Jews received their first impetus from George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda*. Lofty-visioned Mordecai found an echo in many a heart groaning under the yoke of Russian tyranny, and under the banner of Zion, restored, many Jewish colonies sprang up in the Holy Land, telling of the noble energy and perseverance of the Russian Jewish farmer. [While the hope of a national resurrection worked as incentive and inspiration, the arid soil of Judaea was made to blossom forth anew with wheat and wine for the sturdy toiler; and who, whether orthodox or Reform, will find fault with a sentiment so sacred and so stimulating as this? Had Zionism been working on these lines for a slow and peaceful solution of the grave problem arising from overcrowded Jewish Russia and Galicia, there would have been no clashing of opinion, and all classes of Jews, except perhaps the Herzls and Nordaus, would have readily joined.

It would, then, have become self-evident that the plan of colonizing Palestine is to be but a part of a larger scheme. A careful consideration of all the facts would have at once disclosed the necessity of working systematically and with concentrated forces for the training of Jewish farmers all over the world, and for the founding of Jewish agricultural colonies on an extensive scale wherever soil and climate are favorable to such undertakings. Then all the measures taken would have been prompted by sound, practical, common-sense, and supported by the wisest, the best and the wealthiest of Jews. Instead of striking men with fear on account of its being revolutionary, the undertaking might have appealed to the sympathy of the great powers and met with their support.

And yet who knows but, like every revolutionary attempt in history, Zionism is destined to achieve a great deal of good in a way different from the one the projectors of the movement aim at? Divine Providence uses the very errors of man and transforms them into truths. The discovery of America was the result of a geographical error, and in the attempt at finding the philosopher's stone the science of chemistry was born. So may in the council of God the Zionist dream that now fascinates so many, lead to a higher solution of the Jewish Question. When Palestine colonization will have reached its limits—and even now the cry for help comes from the colonists to the throne of the Queen of England—when the Jewish ploughman will find that reward awaits his toil in every land and zone, and intelligent co-operation will include Syria and Mesopotamia in the East and South America in the West; nay, more, when once the Russian Jews find it profitable to aid in the colonization of Siberia, which is now gradually opening as a highway leading to Eastern Asia, will, then, not the call of God to Jacob again be heard: "Let thy seed be as the dust of the earth, and spread to the West and to the East, to the North and to the South, and let all families on earth be blessed in thee."

Any sane effort made by an organization of representative Jews of all countries toward colonization, whether in Palestine or in any other land, for the purpose of ameliorating the

condition of the Eastern sufferers, and offering relief to the congested Jewish quarters in the old world or in the new, would undoubtedly meet with the general approval and support of their co-religionists, no matter whether they call themselves Orthodox or Reform.

But even now Zionism must be credited with a great achievement. It has become the bugle call to rally the lost. It has stirred up the national sentiment in many a Jew thus long alienated from his race and his faith. It has imbued the timid with new courage, and filled the despondent with self-respect. It has reclaimed many indifferent Jews for the common cause, and made wounded race-pride work for the higher interests of Judaism. It certainly has roused a sense of manhood in the Jew. Will cheap Zionism only utter the cry: "Hear, O Israel!" and not strike the higher keynote: "The Lord our God! The Lord is One"?

We need union of forces, organization and consolidation, not political, but social and spiritual. Not a Jewish State, the very name of which is a sword in the hand of our enemies to annihilate us, but a United Judaism is what we need. Too long have the issues of Reform and Orthodoxy, of form and ritual, kept us asunder. Too long has the difference between Eastern and Western culture, between rabbinical and laic wisdom separated Jew from Jew. Too long has each law, each community or congregation, each shade of opinion, nay, each individual, or band of men, stood for autonomy and liberty, while leaving unheeded the obligations and responsibilities incumbent upon all and each. The very watchword of the Jew implied in the name of Judah: "One for all, and all for one!" was forgotten until the cry of the anti-Semite rudely roused us all from our apathy.

'Judaicans,' is the name of our club, by which we have been banded together for the common interest of Jew and Judaism. Zionism divides us. The amelioration of the condition of our poor Eastern brethren is certainly a great and sacred task. But, though it appeals to our sympathy first and foremost, it is a mere bread and butter question, and can not be regarded as the highest and holiest. There are social, educational, political and religious problems to be solved concerning the very soul of Judaism. There is a

solidarity of interests between all the Jews, Eastern or Western, rich or poor, cultured and uncultured, which has as yet found no public recognition. We need a central body of representative men to speak authoritatively on all the great issues of Judaism, to deliberate on all the vital problems, material and intellectual, social and spiritual, educational and philanthropic, and bring about a co-operation of all forces for the elevation of Judaism, for the defense of the name and honor of the Jew, and for counteracting the dangers and abuses that corrupt our life within. We need union and harmony, not schisms and divisions, such as Zionism has brought anew into the camp of Israel. In place of the Zionist Congress which at best represents only the poorer Eastern Jews, and concerns itself only with the material interests of the Jew, let us plead and work for a Pan-Judean Congress, to take place in the year 1900, at the World Exposition in Paris, when in all probability the Jew, Dreyfus, will in the meantime have been vindicated before the tribunal of France as well as before the world. Let a United Synagogue built on the basis of true democracy, allowing for the widest possible diversity of opinion, such as only American Jews could successfully propose; let a United Israel be our watchword as Judaeans.

III. PERSONAL PAPERS

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF MY EARLY LIFE

THE wanderer through the Alps is frequently fascinated by the wondrous sight of the Alpine glow, the afterglow of a glorious day when the sun, after it had gone down behind the mountains, casts its last rays upon the high peaks to make them reflect once more its brilliancy, as if it were still lingering above the horizon. Such an afterglow of great historical periods at the turning-points of history is always interesting to behold. It was my good fortune in the days of my youth to witness such an afterglow of the old Jewish life in its beauty and cheer, before the new era of modernism had altogether dispelled the old traditions with their cherished memories and observances.

MY CHILDHOOD

My native town Fuerth was the seat of a great Yeshibah, which during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw hundreds of disciples (Bahurim), supported by a system of assessment of the well-to-do members of the Kahal, sit at the feet of famous Talmudic scholars summoned there as rabbis from all parts of Germany and Poland. It was widely known also for its Jewish printing press which furnished the student of the Torah with complete editions of the Talmud, the Schulhan Aruk with its commentaries and a large casuistic and liturgical literature. Thus in the religious circle in which I was brought up, it held fast to the proud memories and endearing customs of the ancient days, so that my childhood was passed in an atmosphere of genuine orthodoxy. At the same time my education was thoroughly modern. We spoke and wrote pure German at home, though my parents preferred to carry on their correspondence with their relatives and afterwards with us in Yiddish letters, that is the Hebrew script. My sainted father Moritz (Moses) Kohler, in common with his friends, devoted a portion of

his time after the morning service at the 'Shool' (Synagogue) to the study of the Talmud, and in the evening at home he prepared himself for the following day's portion. The Sulzbach edition of the Talmud which he used, I still possess. It bears the name of my grandfather, Jacob Kaufman, as he signed himself, before the city magistrate, in accordance with the edict of 1812, changed the family name into Kohler. My father initiated me into the Torah by teaching me Chumesh (Pentateuch) in my fifth year, and I remember how proud he was, when I asked him how Abraham could set before the angels the calf and milk together as a meal (Gen. XVIII, 8), and how he pointed to Rashi's solution of the religious problem for me. My sainted mother, Babette Loewenmayer, who died in her 91st year, and on whose tombstone I had the words from the Song of Songs inscribed: "I am asleep, but my heart is awake," was the daughter of David Loewenmayer, the teacher and cantor of the Sulzbuerg community and sister of Dr. Mayer Loewenmayer, the rabbi of Sulzbuerg—related to the Sulzberger family in this country (see J. E. Art. Sulzberger). She loved to quote in her conversation and correspondence from her favorite poets, Lessing and Schiller; so that fondness of the German classics was ingrained in my soul early in life simultaneously with love for Hebrew literature. When I was about six years old, I entered the day school of Simon Bamberger, the learned teacher of the Jewish Orphan Asylum, who combined instruction in Bible and Talmud with secular lessons. He was a pupil of the renowned R. Wolf Hamburger, the last head of the Yeshibah in Fuerth, and I vividly recall the outburst of grief with which my teacher received the news of the demise of the great master on that memorable day, May 15th, 1850, when the whole city was suddenly transformed into one house of mourning and lamentation.

Indeed, with the passing away of Wolf Hamburger the pride and glory of the old communal life departed. It was his tragic fate to see the split of Jewry and Judaism into two camps glaringly brought out among his own pupils. Over against the few men of note that remained staunch adherents to his views and teachings, such as Seligman

Baer Bamberger, Rabbi of Wuerzburg; Abraham Wechsler of Schwabach and a few others, there stood forth as banner-bearers of Reform, or as they were then called, Neologues, Isaac Loewi in his own city, Joseph Aub, Leopold Stein, Bernhard Wechsler, Elias Gruenebaum, M. Gutmann and the most pronounced of all, David Einhorn. Most aggravating and bitter was the conflict between the old and the new in his own community, where the Bavarian Government, in its support of all measures tending to the "enlightenment" of the Jew, took a hostile attitude to the old method of teaching, and finally had the Klaus (Beth Hamidrash), founded 150 years before by Baerman Frankel, an ancestor of his, closed to him altogether. One of the last pupils there, Eisle (Asher) Michael Schueler, my teacher in Hassfurt and Hoechberg, had to hide behind the benches to evade the searching police. A mere nonentity, Dr. Heidegger, was appointed as the official Talmud teacher. Hamburger's former co-laborers, men of great erudition and acumen, such as Joshua Moses Falkenau, Mendel Kargau, Jehuda Gera and Jehuda Loeb Halberstadt, had in my time all gone to their rest. Only their names and characteristic expressions were often mentioned in my hearing. Other venerable scholars I saw being lowered into the grave with an old Torah Scroll at their side as an emblem of their life. The house in which the former rabbi of Fuerth, the great Talmudist R. Zalman Cohn, lived, and the tombstones of Hirsch Yanov (Charif), of Baruch Rappaport and Joseph Steinhart with his learned wife Kroendla, often brought the past glory of Fuerth home to my childhood. Only the noble figure of the adored octogenarian Wolf Hamburger still lives in my memory, as he sat in a chair, after have functioned as Mohel in the house of my mother's uncle Isaac Dispecker, the grandson of David Dispeck, the rabbi of Baiersdorf and Baireuth and previously of Metz, the author of *Pardes David*, with whom Wolf Hamburger corresponded on ritualistic questions. He, my great-great-grand-father, was rather inclined to the pilpulistic method, and the story goes that, when he was summoned to the heavenly Yeshibah he was especially eager to meet the R. M. B. M. (Maimonides), pointing to his 54 discourses

on the 54 Parashioth of the year, in which he endeavored by great acumen to harmonize 365 difficult passages in the Maimonidean Code, but the R. M. B. M. came to him with a smile, saying: "My dear Reb David, I am not at all so full of difficulties as you make me appear." Wolf Hamburger was as far remote from Pilpulism as from mysticism, but as simple in his teaching as in his whole religious life, exceedingly kind and generous to his pupils, and fond of wit and good-natured sarcasm, so as to appreciate clever replies even of his liberal pupils to their conservative antagonists. His long protracted warfare against Dr. Loewi, his chief opponent, ended at last in a sort of truce, as the Government upheld the latter in his insistence on religious tolerance which made friends of Protestants and Catholics and Jews, but the outcome was religious indifference throughout the Jewish community.

MY BOYHOOD

As my native town no longer offered me an opportunity to pursue my Rabbinical studies, my father placed me, when I was about ten years old, in charge of the above-mentioned Talmudist Eisle Michael Schueler in the little town of Hassfurt, with whom I remained four years. A fine type of a modest old-time scholar, he lived on the so-called Shiurim, donations sent to him by generous friends, especially from America, as compensation for Torah lessons in memory of departed relatives.

As I was too young to fast on Atonement Day, I was teased for being a 'Yomkippur-fresser.' So the next year I fasted and from that time on kept all fasts with the rest of the boys. For my Bar Mizwah Derashah I selected, to the surprise of my teacher and of my father who had come to the celebration, the Sabbath discourse on the week's Parashah Behar from my ancestor's work: Pardes David.

In the last year I joined my beloved teacher when he moved to Hoechberg, a village near Wuerzburg, with the view of starting there, in common with Eleazar Ottensosser, a kind of preparatory school to the Yeshibah of Seligman Baer Bamberger of Wuerzburg. Ottensosser, however,

though also a pupil of Wolf Hamburger, was more of a mystic than a scholar, and his method did not appeal to me. All the pupils had to recite their morning benedictions for him after the service in order to enable him to respond to each with Amen and have these put to his account, so as thereby to complete the 100 benedictions the pious Jew is to recite each day. It was said of him that he went over each Talmudic treatise four times but always without the Rosh (an abbreviation of Rabbenu Asheri and at the same time meaning head). One of my fellow students there was Isaac Schwab, who became the rabbi at St. Joseph, Missouri, and whose grandson is now one of our College students. Every Friday afternoon one of us went to Wuerzburg to get fish for the Sabbath eve meals of our teachers, and there I frequently went to Rabbi S. B. Bamberger, an exceedingly fine personality, honored alike by Jew and Gentile for his integrity of character. He would never have any closed letter of his delivered by friends without the stamp required by the Government in order not to rob it of its due, nor would his noble wife shake hands with any man lest her touch arouse unchaste feelings. He remembered my father from the Schindelhof in Fuerth, where our house was in the close neighborhood of the famous Jewish printing press, and when I expressed to him the wish to be admitted into his Yeshibah he told me to wait, lest all my school-mates would follow me and break up the Hoechberg school.

This led me to go to Mayence, where Dr. Lehmann, the rabbi of the orthodox congregation, was just starting a Rabbinical school, offering the students, through the support given by wealthy members, instruction in Latin and Greek, as well as in German composition. His own Rabbinic knowledge, however, was markedly deficient, and I decided to attend the Talmudic lessons given by his father-in-law, Samuel Bondi, grandson and pupil of the renowned Herz Scheuer, a wealthy wine merchant who devoted his afternoons to the Torah. I felt that much of the four years I spent there was time wasted, but whenever I spoke of my intention to go to some University, warning was given me by all the older friends in Fuerth in the familiar Hebrew saying from Proverbs: "None that go to her (the Univer-

sity) returns." Nor would my uncle Dr. Loewenmayer, also a pupil of Wolf Hamburger and at the same time a fine Latin scholar, persuade me to act against the wish of my father, though he encouraged me to deliver little homilies in his Sulzbuerg pulpit despite my immature youth.

Finally, I resolved, when in my 19th year, to go to the Yeshibah at Altona, near Hamburg, over which R. Jacob Ettlinger presided, while two excellent Talmudists, pupils of Moses Sofer in Pressburg, Jacob Cohn and Isaiah Hollander, functioned as Dayanim and assistant teachers. Ettlinger was a remarkable personality. Belonging to a family of scholars in Carlsruhe, Baden, he studied in Wuerzburg under Abraham Bing, while at the same time attending the university. Having been one of the earliest German Rabbis of academic training and having become one of the most prominent and strict upholders of orthodoxy in all its practices and beliefs, the saying was that Satan made him go through the university and come forth immune and loyal so as to lure all the rest of modern rabbis to pursue those studies which caused their disloyalty to traditional Judaism. He was a pronounced mystic and spent hours in prayer, with the two kinds of Tefillin (Rashi's and R. Tam's), on, before he entered the lecture room, where he dwelt chiefly on the Halakik discussions, pointing out difficulties in the most naive fashion. An instance of this is given in his work on Sukkah where he grapples with the question how the Jew on the American hemisphere is to comply with the law requiring the Lulab to be held upwards the way it has grown when the palm branch comes from the other hemisphere, and to hold it as it had grown would mean to hold it upside down. It was, however, a great privilege to enjoy his and his wife's splendid hospitality each Sabbath and festival evening when the richly decked table with its dishes and songs had a peculiar charm. Even the 15th day of Shebat, the day of renewal of the year's vegetation (corresponding to the Valentine Day of Folklore) was made a day of thanksgiving, all kinds of fruits from the various parts of the world being offered for repast. My two years' stay at Altona, where I boarded at the cozy home of Elias Munk and his amiable wife, the sister of

Dr. Israel Hildesheimer of Halberstadt, the leader of orthodoxy in many quarters, were indeed a great experience for me.

SAMSON RAPHAEL HIRSCH

The man who exerted the greatest influence upon my young life and imbued me with the divine ardor of true idealism was none other than the representative of what was called Neo-orthodoxy, Samson Raphael Hirsch, the pupil of Isaac Bernays, the Hakam of Hamburg, author of the anonymous book, *Der Bibel'sche Orient*, and of Jacob Ettlinger when Klaus rabbi in Mannheim. Though he kept himself at a distance from his pupils, as he never invited us to his home nor manifested any personal interest in our welfare or progress, his strong personality was such as to work like a spell upon his hearers. Whether he spoke in the pulpit or expounded the Scripture to large audiences, or led us through the discussions of the Talmud, there was a striking originality and the fascinating power of genius in his grasp of the subject. His method of reading and explaining the Scripture or the Talmud was quite different from the usual way; he made us find the meaning of the passage independently, though his own system of thought was peculiar. His was a strange combination of Hebrew lore and German culture, which culminated in his concept of the 'Jisroel-Mensch,' that is of a humanity which finds its highest expression in loyal, traditional Judaism. Every Saturday night in my letter to the dear ones at home I gave a faithful synopsis of the sermon I heard in the morning and the impressive teachings laid down in the 'Horeb' and other works by Hirsch became part and parcel of my innermost life. At the same time I attended the two highest classes of the Gymnasium of Frankfurt in common with the two sons of Abraham Geiger, but not for the world would I ever approach them with the view of being introduced to their renowned father, the Reform leader. Nor did I ever enter any of the Reform temples either in Frankfurt or Mayence, having been taught to regard them as a Tiflah—a perversion of a house of worship.

Shortly before I left Frankfurt, I had the courage to go to the well-known liberal-minded Jewish philanthropist, B. H. Goldschmidt, and ask him for the grant of a stipend for my University studies out of his large stipendary fund, and he gave me the characteristic answer: "A pupil of Samson Raphael Hirsch, the orthodox rabbi, you come to me for a stipend? I will grant it, feeling certain that before you have finished your university course you will have ceased to be a follower of Hirsch." Sooner than I could expect my change of views came. My Arabic studies under Prof. Mueller in Munich at once undermined the exegetical system of S. R. Hirsch, built upon the assumption that Hebrew was the original language, and the philosophical and historical lectures I attended knocked the bottom out of his whole theology. I passed days and weeks of indescribable woe and despondency; the heavens seemed to fall down upon me and crush me; and the strange tone of my letters puzzled my dear parents so as to make them suspect me of having fallen into bad company. I rallied strength and traveled to Frankfurt to lay my doubts and scruples before my revered teacher; but instead of having these satisfactorily removed, I received the remarkable answer: "My dear Kohler, he who wants to journey around the world must also pass the torrid zone; proceed and you will come back safely." I proceeded in my studies, but did not come back to where I started from. I only felt that having eaten of the thus long forbidden fruit from the tree of knowledge, my eyes opened and I was driven out of the paradise of my childhood.

MY BERLIN LIFE

The Berlin University was now the goal of my ambition. There I hoped to obtain a full response to my innermost longings of heart and mind, but I met one disappointment after another. Dr. Zunz, I was told, was inaccessible to visitors and especially to theological students, and the impression I received from hearing him speak at a political meeting was that he had become a morose misanthrope. To Aaron Bernstein, the author of *Voegele der Maggid*,

then the editor of the *Berliner Volkszeitung*, I came with a card of recommendation from Dr. Stern, Rector of the *Philanthropin* in Frankfurt, his former co-laborer at the formation of the Berlin Reform Congregation, but was greeted with the following words: "You have come here to study theology, but will turn out to be a hypocrite like the rest." As a matter of fact, the dual life which he led in his own home showed him, to the initiated, to have been a real hypocrite. Dr. Joseph Aub with his Bavarian accent was no success in the pulpit of the Northern metropolis, and he said to me in his witty way: "I have been called hither as the Moshiah ben Joseph to prepare the way for Dr. Geiger, the real Moshiah." Though somewhat related to me, as my uncle married a cousin of his, a sister of Hirsch Aub, rabbi of Munich, he never made me feel at home in his house. Dr. Steinschneider's lectures at the Veitel-Heine-Ephraim Institute offered me only the husks of Jewish learning, lists of names and dates of authors and of manuscripts, with all sorts of attacks on other bibliographers; in substance I profited little. In order to keep up my Talmudic studies, I attended daily the lessons of Michael Landsberg, the Klaus rabbi, a man of singular naivete who was easily upset by references to different readings or difficult questions put to him. With the exception of the holy day visits I paid to my relative, Dr. Loewenmayer in Frankfort on the Oder, and the Friday evenings I often spent with his brother-in-law, Dr. Baerwald, afterwards Rector of the *Philanthropin* in Frankfort on the Main, the Jewish life in Berlin appeared to me frosty and uncongenial. All the more was I anxious to make the best of my Biblical, philosophical and historical studies under Profs. Roediger, Dieterici and Trendelenburg, but it was Prof. Steinthal's mythological and ethnological views which exerted the profoundest influence upon my whole thinking and feeling. It was the crisis of my life that I passed while the new ideas crowded upon my mind, driving it more and more from the old moorings, and I had no friend of prominence in the big city to confide in during these days of anxiety and trial. Nor did I have a real Jewish home to keep the cherished memories of old fresh

in me. Still, while wrestling with my God and my own past, I never lost hold upon my ancestral faith, nor did I for a moment become a skeptic, like so many of my fellow-students, most of whom I met at the Jewish restaurant. I only felt that I had outgrown the romanticism and conservatism of those who adhered to the teachings of the Breslau Seminary. So in solitary strength of faith I followed my own ideal of a progressive and liberal Judaism.

MY "SEGEN JACOBS"

As the result of my Berlin studies I wrote and published in 1867 the *Segen Jacobs*, a bold effort at reconstructing the entire historic development of the religious views of the Bible, based upon novel mythological and critical research. It was iconoclastic only insofar as it applied the principle of historical evolution to the whole Pentateuch in opposition to the prevailing view, voiced chiefly by Ewald, of the Mosaic origin of the law. Some of my main arguments were at once adopted by the well-known Dutch critic Abraham Kuenen in his *History of the Religion of Israel* without even the mention of my name except when he differed with me as to detail. Dr. Geiger, however, in his *Zeitschrift* and in private letters welcomed me heartily as a co-laborer in the field of Biblical research and became my warm friend. I left Berlin with a Rabbinical diploma handed to me by Dr. Aub, after I had answered 14 ritual questions for him. "These are your first *Sheelot*," he said jokingly, "and probably also the last you will have to answer."

Dr. Lehmann, my former teacher, in his journal *Der Israelit*, in the bitterest possible terms pronounced anathema against me and my work, and there was consternation in my parental home when the news spread. Dr. Loewi, who had planned to make me a Rabbinical adjunct for the rising congregation of Nuernberg, expressed sorrow at seeing, as he said, my Rabbinical career blocked by what I wrote. "Must a man tell all he knows to people who will hardly understand him?" he said. He did not realize that there was in me something of that fire of which the prophet Jeremiah says, that it cannot be quenched. I went indeed

through the pangs of Jeremiah when I saw my parents, who had built such great hopes upon my future, exposed to fanatical animosity and reproach for not disowning me.

At the suggestion of Dr. Geiger, I took up my Oriental studies in Leipzig under Prof. Fleischer, the eminent Arabic scholar, with the view of preparing for a professorship. There I came into closer contact with Franz Delitzsch and Julius Fuerst. The latter induced me to undertake for him the preparation of the *Illustrierte Juedische Bibel für Israeliten*, but when, at the appearance of the first installment of the work to which I intended to give a real scientific character, I found my name as editor omitted, I gave it up. Altogether my heart was not in mere literary enterprises, and Dr. Geiger pointed to America as the land of promise for progressive Judaism, paving the road for me by warm letters of recommendation to Drs. Einhorn, Adler, Felsenthal and Lilienthal. In the meantime Dr. Lilienthal had written to him on behalf of the Detroit Congregation, asking him to suggest a young rabbi for the vacant position, and I received a call there, while Dr. Einhorn in a number of letters kept me informed about American conditions and finally welcomed me at the landing in New York as an intimate friend. His striking personality at once made a deep impression on me, and his congenial family circle warmly appealed to me. I felt that 'the Lord had led me into the house of kinsmen.' The following year on the self-same day of my arrival in America, August 28th, 1870, I was married to my dear devoted help-mate, Johanna Einhorn. Previous, however, to my sailing across the ocean I attended the Synod at Leipzig, which gave a new impetus to my future career. The assembly of the renowned representatives of Liberal Judaism and the discussions of leading principles were to me a revelation. To hear the masterly address of Prof. Lazarus, the President of the Synod, and other distinguished personalities could only inspire me with new courage and confidence in my calling. At the same time the half-measures agreed upon in the spirit of compromise and the hide and seek policy I observed when meeting these eminent men at closer range, indicated to me a certain timidity which somewhat dampened my enthusiasm.

AMERICA THE LAND OF THE FUTURE

When the sun sets over the Eastern hemisphere, it sends forth under the vast waves of the sea, as it were, the herald of a new day to dawn upon the Western Continent. Before my mind was the vision of the new world, no longer handicapped by fear of authorities and petty consideration of obsolete customs, but offering a free scope for general progress and individual independence and courage of conviction. Buoyed up by this spirit and firmly believing that a benign Providence had assigned to me the special task of working for a complete harmonization of modern thought with the ancient faith in the land of my destination, I prepared mind and heart for entering upon my duties as American Rabbi. I preached my inaugural sermon at the Beth-El Congregation of Detroit the Sabbath before the Jewish New Year, 1869, and three months afterwards, I had the opportunity of meeting the American leaders of Reform Judaism at the Rabbinical Conference of Philadelphia, convened by Drs. Einhorn and Adler, which held its meetings in the house of Samuel Hirsch, and was also attended by Drs. Wise and Lilienthal. On that occasion I heard for the first time an English sermon, which was preached by Dr. Wise, and his words are still vivid in my memory. The broadness of view and independence of thought, which characterized all the deliberations, formed a striking contrast to what I had heard and witnessed at the Leipzig Synod, and I thanked God for having been permitted to come to America, the land of liberty and large opportunity to help, with the powers allotted to me, in the building up of American Reform Judaism, the religion of the future. Looking back upon my years of preparation and my years of activity as American Rabbi, I feel like saying in the words of Scripture: "I have wrestled wrestlings for God, and have prevailed."

DIE EIGENSCHAFTEN EINES GOTTBERUFENEN FÜHRER'S DER GEMEINDE ISRAELS

AN DEN Anfang der grossen Führerlaufbahn Mose's will ich Euch, m. A., führen, seine erste Berufung am Sinai will ich, der Neuberufene, zum Gegenstand meiner Erstlingsbetrachtung machen.

Ein Hirt war Moses, erzählt uns das III, Kap. des 2. Buches Mose; er hütete die Schafe seines Schwiegervaters Jethro, fern von seinen Brüdern, von seinem Volke weiland. Da erscholl am Sinaiberge mitten aus dem flammenden Feuer im Gebüsch der Ruf Gottes an sein Ohr: Ich bin der Gott deiner Väter; ich habe gesehen das Elend meines Volkes in Aegypten, gehe hin und befreie es von seiner Noth; führe es heraus von der Knechtschaft zur Freiheit, von der Erniedrigung zur Hoheit. Aber Moses erwiderte: Wer bin ich dass Du mich zu solcher Stellung berufen willst, dass ich das Volk beim Aegypterkönige vertreten und es als freies Volk aus Aegypten führen sollte? Ich, der unerfahrene, machtlose, in den Künsten der Volksleitung unbewanderte Hirt? Da sprach Gott: Ich werde mit dir sein; ich werde durch dich das grosse Ziel herbeiführen, du sollst mein Diener sein, mein berufenes Werkzeug. Und das Zeichen, dass ich dich gesendet habe soll sein, dass ihr beim Auszuge aus Aegypten als freies Volk gemeinschaftlich an diesem Berge Gott dient. Und weiter sprach Moses: Wenn ich nun hinkomme zu den Söhnen Israels und ihnen sage: der Gott Eurer Väter schickt mich zu Euch, so werden sie mich fragen, wie ist der Name dieses Gottes? was soll ich ihnen antworten. Darauf erwiderte Gott: אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי Ich bin der ich war. Sprich zu den Söhnen Israels: אֲדֹנָי שְׁלוֹחֵנִי אֵלֵיכֶם —Der da sein wird zu allen Zeiten schickt mich zu Euch. Sage zu den Söhnen Israels noch: Der Ewigseiende, der Gott Eurer Väter, Abraham, Isaac und Jakob ist's, der mich zu Euch schicket. וְזֶה שְׁמִי לְעוֹלָם וְזֶה זִכְרִי לְדֹר וָדֹר.—Das ist mein Name ewiglich und das mein Angedenken für alle Geschlechter.—

Erhabene, gehaltvolle Worte, die lehrreich und bedeutungsschwer besonders für den der sich berufen fühlt einzutreten für den Dienst Gottes in dessen Seele der Ruf des *אלהי האומות* des Gottes der Geister, wiederklingt: Gehe hin und leite das Volk, werde ein Führer der Gemeinde Israels, führe die Jugend und das Alter hin zum flammenden Gottesberge, in das Heiligthum der Religion.

Lasset mich darum Geliebte, ein paar Perlen herauslesen aus diesem Gedankenschatze, damit ich sie zum Geschmeide binde für meinen Hals, damit ich sie als Kennzeichen trage an meinem Arm, als Mahnbinde um meine Stirn, damit ich sie als Schild priesterlicher Verantwortlichkeit befestige auf meiner Brust, damit ich sie an die Thürpfosten meiner Werkstätte aufhänge, auf dass ich diese Gottesgedanken stets vor Augen habe und fort und fort daran erinnert werde, dass ich im Dienste Gottes hier stehe vor meiner Gemeinde, auf dass ich mich stets daran erprobe, darin spiegle, um zu sehen, ob ich wenigstens strebe dieses Dienstes vor Gott würdig zu sein.—

Vier hervorragende Eigenschaften sind es vorzugsweise, die den unerprobten Hirten Moses befähigen und würdig erscheinen lassen, Führer eines grossen Volkes zu sein. Vier Eigenschaften, gezeitigt und entwickelt im Gemüths- und im Geistesleben sind es, die schon vor dem Beginn seiner Lauffbahn seinen Seelenadel bekundeten und die durch sein ganzes Leben und Wirken als Strahlen göttlichen Abglanzes in den Augen Israels hervortreten. Das sind:

I. Zwei Eigenschaften des Gemüthes: 1. Demuth und 2. Mitgefühl.

II. Zwei Eigenschaften des Geistes: 1. Ein geschichtlicher Sinn für das Alte; für die Erinnerungen und Ueberkommnisse der alten Zeit, und 2. ein offenes Verständniss für die Aufgaben und Errungenschaften der neuen Zeit, für die Ansprüche der Gegenwart und der Zukunft.

Diese wollen wir an der Hand unseres Textes näher betrachten.

I

Demuthsvolle Bescheidenheit ist die erste Führertugend, die uns aus dem Gemüthsleben Mose's entgegenstrahlt.

Als ihm der Ruf Gottes kund wird: Geh', führe dein Volk aus Aegypten, erwiderte er: מי אנכי—Wer bin ich, dass ich Israels Führer zu sein vermöchte?

מי אנכי—Wer bin ich? fragt Moses?! Meine Freunde! Es gibt eine wahre und eine falsche Demuth. Es gibt eine Demuth, die uns in der Seele widerwärtig ist, die das Gegentheil von dem ist, was sie sein soll. Es gibt eine Bescheidenheit des Scheins, die aus einem hochfahrenden Gemüthe hervorgeht und die das Gefühl der Grösse, das Bewusstsein der Ueberlegenheit gleissnerisch in das Gewand der Demuth kleidet, um aus dieser falschen Hülle desto schärfer hervorzustehen. Ihr kennt diese heuchlerische Demuth, aber schön werdet Ihr sie nicht finden, am allerwenigsten bei Moses suchen. Und doch will es Euch nicht bedünken, als vernähmet Ihr den Klang dieser falschen Demuth aus den Worten: Wer bin ich? im Munde eines Moses? Ein Mann wie Moses sollte wirklich von sich die Meinung gehegt haben, er stände seinen Brüdern an Wissen, an Erfahrung und Lebensklugkeit, an Geistes- und sittlicher Bildung, an Adel und Machtstellung, an äusseren und inneren Vorzügen nach? Er, der Levite, aus dem edelsten Zweig des edelsten Stammes hervorgewachsen, der Bruder Ahrons und Miriam's, der vielgewanderte und unterrichtete Schwiegersohn des Midjanitenfürsten Jethro—er sollte von allem dem, was ihn zum grössten der Propheten, was ihn zum Moses machte, nichts in sich verspürt haben? Er sollte sich zu den Geringsten und Unbedeutensten des Volkes, zu denen gezählt haben, die keinen Beruf hatten, an dem religiösen und politischen Befreiungswerke Israel's zu arbeiten? Nein, so gering dachte Moses nicht von sich, einer solchen Bescheidenheit könnte er aus eitler Selbstverkenennung oder gar aus falscher Selbstverleugnung in seiner Seele, in seiner Sprache vor Gott nicht Raum geben.

Es ist ein anderes Demuthsgefühl, dass ihn durchdrang. Es ist das Gefühl der Demuth, das den Berufenen ergreift, wenn er erfüllt von der Grösse seines Berufes, der Unzulänglichkeit seiner Kraft bewusst wird. Es ist das Bewusstsein der Niedrigkeit das den Hohen erfüllt im Anblick der höheren Aufgabe, die ihm gestellt ist. Es ist das Innwerden menschlicher Ohnmacht, menschlicher Begrenztheit, das der

Weiseste und Mächtigste empfindet, wenn er das unabsehbar weite Gebiet seines Wirkungskreises überschaut, in den er sich gestellt sieht. Wohl fühlte Moses die gebieterische Wahrheit seines Berufes; wohl empfand er, dass die wunderbare Sinaiflamme einen glühenden Funken in seine Seele geworfen hatte, der fortloderte und zündete; wohl verspürte er in seiner Brust den lebendigen Wiederklang der göttlichen Berufsstimme. Aber er fühlte auch die Schwere dieses Berufes, die Macht der Verantwortlichkeit, die ihm Gott auferlegte. Gegenüber der Grösse seiner Aufgabe empfand er das Gefühl seiner Kleinheit, im Hinblick auf die Höhe seines idealen Zieles sah er sich gering und schwach. Weil er sich nicht allein gewachsen glaubt den mannigfachen Pflichten und Obliegenheiten eines so grossen Berufes, darum fragt er מי אני Wer bin ich?

מי אני כך אמר משה לפני הקב"ה רבון העולמים כשירד יעקב למצרים
לא כך אמרת לו אני ארד עמך מצרים ואני אעלך גם עלה לא אני
הוא שאמר לו ואני אעלך גם עלה

‘Wer bin ich’ erklären die Alten also: Moses sagte zu Gott: Lenker der Welt, Du hast ja dem Ahn Jacob verheissen, wie Du mit ihm nach Aegypten hinabzogst, wolltest Du die Jacobsfamilie auch wider heraufführen, und nun heissest Du mir, dass ich Israel heraus führe. Wer bin ich, dass ich Deine Stelle vertreten, dass ich eine That vollführen könnte, die nur in Deiner Macht steht? Und die Erwiderung Gottes lautet: Ich, der Weltenlenker, bin ja mit dir, ich, der Gott der Geister, beseele deinen Geist. Du bist nur der Vollstrecker meines Willens, mein Bote.—

Diese Demuth im Angesicht Gottes, dieses Sichkleinfühlen in Anbetracht der göttlichen Berufspflichten, diese echte Bescheidenheit war eine der Glanztugenden an der Strahlenkrone Moses. “Der Mann Mose war sehr bescheiden, mehr als irgend ein Mensch auf dem ganzen Erdenrund,” erzählt in nüchterner Sprache die heilige Schrift und sie gibt uns auch ein herrliches Beispiel dieser seiner wahren Selbstverleugnung. Ausser den 70 Männern, die auf Geheiss Gottes von Moses dazu ernannt waren, an seiner Seite das Volk zu belehren und zu richten und göttliche Offenbarungen kund zu geben, waren im Lager Israels noch andere Männer, die sich berufen fühlten im Namen Gottes zum Volke zu

sprechen. Das berichtete eilig der diensteifrige Josua seinem Meister und sprach: Mose, mein Herr, wehre es ihnen doch! Da entgegnete Moses: Eiferst du für meine Person? O, wer gäbe, dass das ganze Volk Propheten wären, dass sie Alle von dem höheren Gottesgeiste beseelt wären!

Meine Andächtigen! Möchtet Ihr nicht bei diesem Ausspruch Moses ausrufen: Wer gäbe, dass alle Führer Israels sich diesen Führer zum Vorbild nahmen!

2) Und eine andere Seite menschlichen Gemüthslebens berührt die Gottheit da sie Moses zum Führer ernennt—sein Mitgefühl für das Wohl und Weh der Mitmenschen, das theilnahmsvolle Herz für seines Volkes Wohlfahrt und Gedeihen.

Dieses Mitgefühl, dieses Leid und Freude theilende Herz für die Menschheit war ja der Leitstern der Jugendgeschichte Moses und durch Moses auch der Leitstern der Geschichte Israels geworden. Menschliches Mitgefühl, zarte Regung des Herzens der Pharaotochter für das weinende Knäblein im Schilf war es, was Moses das Leben rettete und ihm vielleicht eine edlere Erziehung bei Hofe sicherte. Menschliches Mitgefühl war's, was den Jüngling aus den Prachtgemächern des Königspalastes heraustrieb und zu seinen gedrückten Brüdern hinzog, um lieber mit ihnen zu leiden und zu dulden als mit den Grossen des Reiches in Wonne und Ueppigkeit zu schwelgen. Menschliches Mitgefühl war's, was ihn dazu verleitete, preiszugeben seine Gunst und seinen Einfluss bei Hofe, hintenanzusetzen jede Rücksicht auf seine Person und den misshandelten Hebräer zu rächen. Und dieses mitfühlende Menschenherz schlug nicht bloß für seine israelitischen Brüder; jedes menschliche Leiden, jedes ungerechte Dulden berührte die sanften Saiten seines Gemüths. Ein Fremder auf midjanitischem Boden sah er die Töchter eines Hirten von anderen Hirten übel und rauh behandelt und alsbald, ohne zu fragen, wer die Bedrückten seien und wer die Bedrücker, steht er den Hirtinnen bei und verhilft ihnen zu ihrem Rechte. Und wie er nun dieses Hirtenfürsten Jethro Eidam geworden war, wie er eines sorgenlosen Schäferlebens geniessen könnte, möchte da sein Herz aufgehört haben so warm zu schlagen

für das Wohl der Menschen dadraussen? Möchte da sein Gemüth gleichgültig geworden sein gegen die Drangsale und das Elend seiner Brüder in der Ferne?

Gar trefflich wissen die Rabbinen den Charakterzug eines Moses zu zeichnen wenn sie erzählen: Gott prüfte Moses, ob er auch ein guter Hirte sei. Er sah ihm zu, wie ihm ein Böcklein aus der Heerde entsprang, wie er es allenthalben suchte und ihm als er seiner ansichtig wurde, nacheilte bis er es an einem Weidenbusch erreichte. Hinter dem Gebüsch aber war eine Wasserquelle und da hinein war das Böcklein rasch gesprungen, um seinen Durst zu löschen. Als Moses das gewahrte, sagte er: Das wusste ich freilich nicht, dass Du von Durst gequält davonliefst. Und da ich dich so unverdeienterweise in Hast versetzt habe, will ich dich wieder in Ruhe zurückbringen in deine Heerde. Da sprach Gott: Ein solches Mitgefühl für das sprachlose Thier aus deiner Heerde wohnt in deiner Brust, welch' ein reges Mitgefühl muss erst für eine deiner Obhut anvertraute Menschheit in dir leben.

הוּי וּמִשָּׁה הִיָּה רֵעָה—Das ist der Zusammenhang des Hirtenberufes Moses mit dem ihm zugedachten Berufe eines Volkshirten.

Ja wohl, dieses Menschlichkeitsgefühl, diese Theilnahme an seiner Brüder Wohl und Wehe war der Zündstoff, der seine Seele erfasste und zu der heiligen Glut entflammte, die in so fassbarer Gestalt sich seinem Geiste am Sinai darstellte. Aus diesem Mitgefühl vernahm er die Stimme Gottes, welche in seiner Brust ertönte: רָאָה רֵאִיתִי אֶת עַמִּי—Ich habe gesehen, gesehen wie Du das Elend meines Volkes in Aegypten, aber gesehen mehr wie Du, auch das Ende seines Leidens, seine Befreiung durch Dich.—

רָאָה רֵאִיתִי שְׁתֵּי רֵאִיוֹת אַחַת רֵאִיָּה אַחַת וְאַנִּי רֵאִוָּה שְׁתֵּי רֵאִיוֹת

Und Moses bewahrte dieses warme, für seines Volkes Wohl so hoch schlagende Herz durch sein ganzes Leben der Gemeinde Israel, wie oft sie ihm auch das Vertrauen kündigte, wie oft sie auch ihre Treue gegen Gott und seinen Gesandten brach. Er ermüdete nicht, so oft sie sich auch versündigte, ihr Fürsprecher zu sein bei Gott und seine Verzeihung zu erwirken, stets bereit, sein Leben, seine Seligkeit für seines Volkes Zukunft preiszugeben.

Das Mitgefühl für seine Mitgeschöpfe war die Triebfeder aller seiner Handlungen, die Sorge für seine Gemeinde sein erster und sein letzter Gedanke.

Ein treuer Hirt wie er war, ist sein letzter heissester Wunsch, nicht dass seiner Söhne einer sein Nachfolger sei im Amte, sondern der dass Gott den geeigneten Mann bestelle für die Gemeinde, damit die Gottesschaar nicht sei gleich der Heerde ohne den geeigneten Hirten.—

So war das Gemüthsleben des ersten Führer's Israels beschaffen. O, meine Brüder und Schwestern, wie schwer ist ein Beruf, dem ein solches Vorbild vorgezeichnet ist!

II

Und wie soll das Geistesleben, namentlich das religiöse Geistesleben beschaffen sein bei dem gottberufenen Führer einer Gemeinde? Von zwei Triebkräften ist das Geistesleben der Menschheit und des einzelnen Menschen bewegt, von zwei Gegenrichtungen geregelt, geleitet und in richtigem Geleise gehalten.

אחור וקדם צרתי

Rückwärts und vorwärts gerichtet hat Gott den Trieb des Menschengestes gebildet. Und diese Doppelrichtung des Geistes muss sich besonders im religiösen Führer einer Menschheit ausprägen. Er vor Allen muss mitbringen den geschichtlichen Sinn für das Alte, würdigende Anerkennung für die Erinnerung und Ueberkomnisse der Vergangenheit, aber zu gleicher Zeit auch ein offenes Verständniss für die sittlichen Aufgaben und Errungenschaften der Gegenwart, einen klaren Blick für die Ansprüche, für den Anbruch einer neuen Zeit.

1) אחור צרתי Ein rückwärts gerichteter Blick, ein anhänglicher, ein geschichtlicher Sinn für die Vergangenheit ist eine vorzüglich nothwendige Geistesbeschaffenheit eines wahren Gottesboten. Das erste Offenbarungswort Gottes an Moses lautet: אנכי אלהי אביך—Ich bin der Gott Deiner Väter, der Gott Abrahams, der Gott Isaacs und der Gott Jacobs.

Beherrzigen wir es wohl, Geliebte! Moses, der gekommen war, seinem Volke einen neuen Gottesgedanken, eine bis dahin noch nicht geoffenbarte, eine bis dahin noch nicht

erkannte, eine bis dahin noch nicht geübte Religion zu bringen, er sieht in seinem Gotte nur den Gott der Väter. Ihm, der eine um Vieles höhere Geistesstufe erstiegen, der zu einem um Vieles höheren Geistes- und Gottesbewusstsein sich emporgeschwungen hatte, als seine Vorfahren ihm offenbart sich die Gottesidee doch nur als der Gott Abrahams, Isaacs, und Jacobs.

בשעה שנגלה הקב"ה למשה מידון היה משה לנבואה אמר הקב"ה אם נגלה אני עליו בקול גדול אני מבעתו בקול נמוך בוחר הוא על הנבואה מה עשה נגלה עליו בקולו של אביו:

Ein Neuling sagen die Weisen war Moses in der Prophetengabe und da erwog Gott: Wenn ich ihm in einer unerhört neuen, in ihrer Kraft ihm ungekannten Stimme mich offenbare, so wird sein Gemüth von Furcht und Grausen ergriffen und bange sich abwenden; wenn ich mit einem ganz gewöhnlichen, dem andren Leben entnommenen Stimme mich offenbare, so ist die Wirkung nur eine schwache, sein Geist wird nicht aufgerüttelt. Ich will an das Kindesherz anschlagen, wo die väterliche Stimme so kräftig wiederhallt; ich will durch die Stimme kindlicher Ehrfurcht sein Gemüth erfassen. Ich will ihm als der Gott seines Vaters erscheinen.

Allerdings offenbart sich Gott dem Moses unter einem neuen höheren Namen unter dem er den Vätern nicht erschienen war; allerdings waren es höhere Eigenschaften, in welchen der Geist des Moses die Gottheit erschaute, als es seine Vorfahren vermochten. Die Schrift berichtet es ja selbst:

וארא אל אברהם אל יצחק ואל יעקב באל שדי ושמי יהוה לא נודעתי להם:

Gott war den Vätern als der allgewaltige Lenker der Naturgewalten in seiner Furcht und Grösse erschienen, aber in der höheren Eigenschaft eines rein geistigen, über alle Sinnlichkeit erhabenen Wesens, als der Ewigseiende war er ihnen nicht kund geworden. Und doch kommt er nur im Namen des alten Väterglaubens, im Namen des alten Vätergottes zum Volke mit den Worten:

אלהי אבותיכם נראה אלי: אלהי אבותיכם שלחני אליכם:

Der Gott Eurer Väter ist mir erschienen, der Gott Eurer Väter schickt mich zu Euch. Glüht noch, will er sagen, ein Funke kindlicher Pietät in Eurem Herzen,

habt Ihr mit zartem Sinn die schönen Tugendbilder Eurer Väter in Eurem Gedächtnisse bewahrt, die Erinnerungen an die Sitten Eurer Vorfahren auch Euren Kindern als kostbare Vermächtnisse Israels vererbt, hat das Aegypterland nicht jeden Nachhall der heiligen Heimathsklänge vom Jordan und Euphrat, nicht jeden Keim der altväterlichen religiösen Innigkeit und Hingebung an die Gottheit in Euch erstickt, lebt noch der Gedanke an den Gott der Väter in Euch, so könnet Ihr Euch aus Eurer politischen und religiösen Gesunkenheit erheben, so werdet Ihr den Weckruf der Freiheit bald vernehmen, so werdet Ihr Euch noch zur Höhe einer Nation emporheben, die berufen ist zu herrschen, eine sittliche und geistige Macht auszuüben über die Völker. So lautet der Aufruf Moses an sein Volk.

Der alte Väterglaube, die alten Vatersitten, die altheimischen Erinnerungen beseligenden Heiligkeit, das, meine Theuren, waren die Grundlagen auf denen Moses seinen grossen Bau aufrichtete, das sind die festen Grundsäulen, auf denen unser Judenthum immer bestanden hat und ferner bestehen soll. Der alte Vätergott:

האלהים אשר התהלכו אבותי לפניו אברהם ויצחק האלהים הרועה אותי מעודי עד היום הזה המלאך הגואל אותי מכל רע יברך את הנערים ויקרא בהם שמי ושם אבותי אברהם ויצחק:

Der Gott vor dem meine Väter gewandelt haben, Abraham und Isaac, der Gott, der mich geleitet, seitdem ich bin, bis auf diesen Tag, der mich vor allem Bösen geschützt hat, er segne die Jugend, dass durch sie mein Name genannt werde und der Name meiner Väter!—das ist der Segen unserer Eltern und Grosseltern für uns, und das soll fernerhin der Segen eines jeden jüdischen Vaters für sein Kind und seines Kindes Kind bis in alle Zeiten sein. Die Erinnerung an das Beispiel unserer Väter, die in so hingebender Treue und Frömmigkeit in allen Lebenslagen im Glück wie im Unglück mit der Aufopferung des Edelsten und Besten ihrer Güter Gott gedient haben durch ihr ganzes Leben, die Erinnerung an unsre grosse und edle Vergangenheit lasset uns, meine Brüder und Schwestern, als köstlichen Schatz in unsrem Innern bewahren für uns und unsre Kinder. Edle Mütter, strebsame Väter in Israel! auch wir wollen, wo wir unsren Kindern beibringen wollen die ersten

Regungen eines höheren Bewusstseins vor einem Wesen über uns, die Regungen eines religiösen Lebens, sie erziehen im Glauben der Väter, wollen ihr Herz dafür empfänglich machen, dass sich auch ihnen Gott offenbare als Gott der Väter **אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵינוּ**—Mag es immer kommen, dass sie es erfahren, dass unsre Väter gekeucht haben unter dem Druck geistiger wie leiblicher Beengung, dass ihr Blick zu sehr getrübt und eingeschränkt war von Elend und Kummer, um beim Aufwärtsschauen die Welt so weit ausgedehnt, um die Menschheit so gross, um den Geist so hoch, um das Herz des himmlischen Vaters so weit geöffnet zur Liebe für alle Menschen und Völker zu finden, wie wir;—mögen sie es immer erfahren; dass wir weiter vorgeschritten sind an Geistes Bildung und Gesittung, an Erkenntniss und Einsicht als unsre Eltern,—doch immer **דַּע אֵת אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵינוּ** sollen sie den Vätergott als ihren Gott erkennen und mit derselben Innigkeit, mit derselben Liebe zu Gott, mit der gleichen Sorgfalt und Pflege des Geistes und Gemüthes den Gottesgedanken forttragen durch die Zeiten. Immer sollen die Liebe zu den Eltern, die Anhänglichkeit für die Väter die Staffel sein auf der das Kind zur Liebe zu Gott, zum himmlischen Vater emporgehoben wird.—Die theuren geschichtlichen Vermächtnisse unsrer Vorfahren sollen uns unsre Religion heiliger machen, die Kenntniss der grossen und unvergleichlichen Geschichte des Judenthums soll uns unser Judenthum theuer und immer theurer machen. Das ist eine der Hauptaufgaben des Führers einer jüdischen Gemeinde, und dazu muss sie ihm völlig Herz und Ohr schenken.

2) Und ein vorwärts gerichteter Geistesblick, ein klares Verständniss für die neue Zeit ist die zweite nothwendige Geistesbeschaffenheit eines religiösen Führers. **וְקִדְמָה צִרְתִּי**—Vorwärtsschreitend ist die Entwicklung der Menschheit. Auch der religiöse Geist des Menschen steht nicht still, sondern von den fortschreitenden Bewegungen der Geistesbildung und Kulturentwicklung mit bewegt, hat auch er sich emporzuringen zu immer höherer Vollendung. Der Menscheng Geist ist ja das Spiegelbild des Gottesgeistes, und dem höher entwickelten Menschen spiegelt sich auch das Bild der Gottheit in einer höheren vollkommeneren Form

ab. Die heilige Schrift selbst belehrt uns darüber, dass die Anschauung der Menschen von Gott stets fortschreitet, sich vergeistigend und verklärend. Von Adam bis Noah, von Noah bis Abraham, von Abraham bis Moses sehen wir die Stufen einer Himmelsleiter, die immer höher aufwärts führt zur wahren Gottesverehrung. Und der Offenbarungsgedanke am Sinai wächst und wächst und wächst—von Moses, von Samuel und Elias bis zu den Propheten Hosea und Joel, Micha und Jesaias. Und weiter suchen sich die Saatenkörner des Judenthums, abgelöst vom Boden der Heimath im Boden und treiben neue Blüthen und Knospen am Stamme des Rabbinismus und weit über das Judenthum hinaus überallhin fallen als Keime neuer sittlicher Wahrheiten die Worte der Weisen, der Männer der Versammlung, geleitet und geeint durch einen Hirten.

Alle die geistesgewaltigen Lehrer und Führer in Israel haben durch ihre Auffassung und Erklärung, durch ihre Deutung und Umdeutung, ja Umgestaltung des göttlichen Schriftwortes je nach den Bedürfnissen und Anschauungen der Zeit mit echt religiösem Ernst und Sinn dafür Sorge getragen, dass die Religion des Judenthums nicht wurde zu einem veralteten Gesetz. Die Worte Gottes, sagten sie, dürften den Menschen nicht werden gleich einem längst verjährten Regierungsbefehl, den kein Mensch mehr beachtet כדיוטומא חדשה שאין אדם סופנה—vielmehr sollen sie stets sein frisch dem Leben entnommen, dem Geiste des Lebens entsprechend, als wären sie heute gegeben, so dass sie stets frische Nahrung dem Herzen und Geiste Aller zuführen לשנתם לבניך—and dass sie auch den Geist der Kinder schärfen und ihr Gemüth Weihend erheben und kräftigen.

Und uns, meine Andächtigen, uns sollten die Heiligtümer der Religion wirklich veralten und verkümmert sein und bleiben? Unser Judenthum mit seinen hergebrachten Bräuchen und mit seinen ewigen Gesetzen sollte zu einem Raritätenkasten seltsamer alter Formen, zu einem wirklichen Schatze von Alterthümern uns werden, die wir unsern Kindern und Enkeln zu ihrem Bewundern und Staunen zeigen wollen mit den Worten: Seht, so haben sich unsere Grosseltern geführt, in diesen alten Formen und Schranken

bewegte sich ihr religiöses und bürgerliches Leben und diese haben wir in unsrer Synagoge bewahrt und halten sie aus Pietät bei. Also bloß noch Sache der Pietät, nicht mehr jener heilige Quell des sittlichen und geistigen Lebens und Wohles, aus dem man Wahrheit und Trost, Ermuthigung und Beseligung in den verschiedenen Lebenslagen schöpft, soll uns die Religion sein, wie sie es unseren Vätern gewesen? Uns sollte das göttliche Gesetz mit seinen erhabenen ewig göttlichen und menschlichen Lehren gleich irgend einer alten Gesetzesurkunde veralten und verrosten, uns und unseren Kindern entfremdet, gleich einer versteinerten Mumie unkenntlich starr und leblos werden? Unser Judenthum meine Brüder soll nicht mehr unser Stolz und Ruhm im öffentlichen Leben unsre Wahrheit und Vernunftigkeit vor den Augen aller Völker sein können, wie vor 2 und 3,000 Jahren? Unsre Kinder sollten nicht mehr von jener Wärme und erhebenden Begeisterung für den Väterglauben, von jenem glühenden Streben nach *עוֹלָם וָעוֹלָם*, nach der Verherrlichung des göttlichen Namens, der über Israel genannt ist, des Namens Israels vor allen Menschen durchhaucht und beseelt sein und des Namens Israels, des Kämpfers für die Gottessache des Namens ihres alten Gottes, den alle gebildeten Nationen, heutigen Tages als ihren Gott erkennen und anbeten sich schämen lernen? sich schämen, Juden zu sein, einer Religion anzugehören, die das Heil und den Segen der ganzen Menschheit zu ihrem Ziel erkoren hat und von der die heilige Schrift selbst sagt, sie ist nicht im fernen Himmel, daß man zu sagen brauchte: Steige als Vermittler für uns in den Himmel und bringe uns die Seligkeit mit; sie ist nicht jenseits des Meeres, daß man erst hinüberfahren müsste, um dorthier die rechte Form der Gottesverehrung und des Gottesdienstes zu holen und zu erfahren. Das göttliche Wort ist Dir gar nahe, in deinem Munde, in Deinem Herzen liegt es offen, klar und verständlich da. Thue das, das ist Gottes Gebot, echtes Leben, echtes frisches Leben des Geistes und Gemüthes, nicht vertrocknete Satzungen und anerlernte Menschenwerkheiligkeit, nicht Uebung von Bräuchen aus einer längst verflossenen Zeit, deren Sinn und Zweck unserer Zeit abhanden gekommen ist.

Nein. Unser Gott heisst: **אֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר אֲדֹנָי**—Ich bin der ich war und werde sein, wie ich gewesen. **אֲנִי הָיִיתִי אֲנִי הוּא עַכְשָׁיו**—Ich will nicht bloss als der Gott ihrer Väter, als der Gott der Vergangenheit, ich will auch von ihren Kindern, ich will als der Zukunft Gott erkannt und verehrt sein, spricht Gott zu Moses. Sprich zu den Söhnen Israels—**כֹּה תֹאמַר אֶל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲדֹנָי שְׁלַחֲנִי אֵלֵיכֶם**—Der Gott der Zukunft schickt mich zu Euch. Du musst ihren Blick eröffnen für die Zukunft, ihren Geist schärfen für die Auffassung ihres höheren Völkerberufes, für die Pflichten und Aufgaben einer neuen Zeit der Freiheit und Selbstständigkeit. Das Zeichen, das ich dich gesandt habe, soll sein, dass Du mit dem Auszuge Israels ans Aegypten deine Aufgabe noch nicht gelöst, dein Ziel noch nicht erreicht siehst, bis sie mit dir gemeinschaftlich auch dahinstreben, Gott zu dienen im Geiste der Offenbarung am Berge Sinai, bis sie mit der Freiheit auch den Sinn und den Ernst für die Ansprüche und Ziele wahrer Freiheit sich zu eigen gemacht haben. So lautet das Wort Gottes an Moses beim Anbeginn einer neuen Zeit der Freiheit für Israel. Und dasselbe Gotteswort ergeht an dem Führer einer Gemeinde Israels im Anfang einer noch grösseren Zeit der Freiheit und der freien Selbstbestimmung nicht blos für den leiblichen, sondern auch für den geistigen Menschen, für den Menschengest. Und dasselbe Wort Gottes ergeht in noch verstärkterem Maasse ermuthigend und ermahnend an den Führer einer jüdischen Gemeinde in dem neuen Lande wahrer Freiheit und voller Menschengleichheit, indem wir wohnen in einem Lande auf das die Augen Gottes gerichtet sind, die Arbeit der Menschenhände und die friedliche Betriebsamkeit der Menschen-Gesellschaft reichlich zu segnen vom Anfang bis zum Ende des Jahres, dessen der Boden reichlichen Lohn entgegenreift dem Bebauer und Bearbeiter, überfliegend von Milch und Honig und dessen Bewohner, verschont von dem Fluch alter Zeiten und alter Vorurtheile, friedlich nebeneinander wohnen unter dem Schutze der gleichen Rechte für Alle, Jeder unter dem Schatten seines Hauses und seines Baumes im Bewusstsein, ein ganzer Mensch unter freien Menschen, ein gleichberechtigter Bürger, unter freien Bürgern zu sein. Unser Gott

heisst: **אֲדִידָה אֲשֶׁר אֲדִידָה**—Ich bin und werde sein, wie ich war. Unser Gott ist der alte Gott vom Sinai her, dessen Offenbarung heute nicht mehr bloß Israels winziges Völklein, sondern die ganze gebildete Menschheit hört und beherzt, wofern sie nur hineingreift in ihr Herz und die Perlen echter Religiösität hervorholt, die im Lichte des heutigen, entwickelten Menschengestes funkeln und glänzen, wie die Offenbarungsfunken vom Sinai. Und er ist auch der Gott der Zukunft, der grossen Zukunft der Menschheit, die, wie unsere Propheten es aus begeistertem Fernblick geschaut haben, sich in der Liebe zu Gott und in dem Streben nach Wissen und Wahrheit und Gotteserkenntniss sich einigen und versöhnen und voll Eintracht und Liebe die Arbeit und die Kunst und die Segnungen des Friedens hegen und pflegen wird. An dieser Zukunft hat Israel zu arbeiten, für diese Aufgaben wahrer Freiheit müssen ihm seine Führer und Lehrer die Augen, Geist und Herz öffnen.

Es ist nichts damit gethan, wenn man bloß auf ein paar Tage sich von Mizraim's Arbeitslast entfernt, auf 3 Tage bloß zu einem Gottesdienst sich versammelt, um dann wieder zurückzufallen in den niedrigen Slavensinn, in den Dunstkreis rein himmlischer Bestrebungen, in die Geistesöde Mizraims. Es nützt nichts, wenn man bloß feiert **שְׁלֹשָׁה יָמִים בַּמִּדְבָּר**—auf 3 Tage einen Gottesdienst nach althergebrachter Weise veranstalten in der Oede, ohne Weihe, ohne Erhebung, ohne dauernde und nachhaltige Nahrung für das von heiliger Sehnsucht erfüllte Gemüth, ohne dass das Volk sich wirklich erhebe **קָשָׁה רֹחוֹ וּמַעְבֻּדָּה** aus der Beengung des Geistes und der Verhärtung des Gemüthes, ohne dass das Herz hoch schlagen gelernt hat für alles Edle, Gute und Wahre, ohne dass der Geist sich emporgeschwungen hat zur Höhe des Ideals, ohne dass der Blick sich erweitert hat für die Zukunft. Nein; die Art Gott zu dienen muss eine bessere, von gemüthsergreifenderer Natur sein, das freie Volk soll auch den Berg wahrer Freiheit ersteigen lernen, seiner neuen Berufsaufgaben vor Gott ganz und voll bewusst werden. Mit unserem ganzen Leben und Streben, Schaffen und Ringen müssen und wollen wir, Geliebte, diesen Gottesdienst zu bethätigen trachten—**בְּנַעֲרֵינוּ וּבִזְקֵינוּ**—mit unsren Jünglingen und Greisen, mit

unsren Söhnen und Töchtern; die Jugend mit ihren Idealen und das Alter mit seinen Erfahrungen, der Mann mit seinem Thaternenste und die Frau mit ihrem zarten Gemüthe, sie sollen Alle von dem Gedanken getragen sein, aus innigem Herzensdrang in dem Genusse der Freiheit Gott zu dienen, und an der grossen Zukunft zu arbeiten, die Segen bringen soll der ganzen Menschheit.

Und auf dem Banner der Freiheit leuchten die Worte: **היהוה אלהינו** Gott der Vergangenheit ist auch Gott der Zukunft. Das ist der Gedanke, von dem die Geschichte Israels getragen, in welchen seine Vergangenheit und Zukunft sich zusammenschliessen. In ihm kommt die zweifache Richtung des Geistes, die vorwärtstreibende und die rückwärts in dem Erinnerungen der Vergangenheit haftende Strömung zur Versöhnung. Diese beiden Worte sind die Losungsworte eines gottberufenen echten Führers, wie Moses. Und wenn sie nicht Vertrauen fassen und nicht hören auf die Stimme des ersten Zeichens, so werden sie durch den Klang des zweiten Zeichens dir gewonnen werden und deiner Führung sich anvertrauen. Sie Alle werden dann an deinen Bestrebungen theilnehmen, Jeder mit seiner Kraft nach seiner Lebensstellung mit Opferfreudigkeit und Begeisterung an dem heiligen Werke arbeiten und das Wohl und Gedeihen der Gesammtheit fördern. Und es wird nicht jeder Einzelne dann sich seine eigene Höhe bauen, sich seine eigene Religion bilden und in besonderer Weise Gott dienen und in besonderer Weise Menschenwohl fördern und von der Gesammtheit sich ausschliessen. Sondern **בדוציאך** **היהוה** wenn du dein Volk aus Mizraims niedrigem Slavensinn erhoben hast zur Freiheit und Menschlichkeit, so werdet ihr gemeinsam, du und das Volk, die Gemeinde mit ihrem Führer, den Berg echter Geistesfreiheit und edler, würdiger Gottesverehrung ersteigen, um Gott den Einzigen als den Vater, als Vater aller Menschen zu ehrfürchten und zu lieben, um die ganze Menschheit als eine Bruderfamilie in Liebe und Eintracht zu umfassen.

Das ist der Ruf Gottes an den Israelitischen Führer.

So lasset mich denn, meine Theuren, diesem Berufe gerecht werden, lasset uns gemeinsam diesen Zielen entgegenstreben,

an dieser heiligen Stätte unsren Dienst Gott und der Menschheit weihen; dahin unser Streben für die Gegenwart und die Zukunft für die liebe hoffnungsreiche Jugend gerichtet sein. Dazu wollet Ihr, meine Brüder und Schwestern, mich unterstützen, dazu mir mit Euren Erfahrungen und Erinnerungen, Ihr edlen Mütter und Väter meiner lieben Gemeinde, mit Euren Hoffnungen und Wünschen, Ihr jungen Männer und Frauen, vertrauensvoll entgegenkommen, dazu mit Eurem vollen Vertrauen mich kräftigen und ermuthigen. Dazu wollest Du, o Gott, Deinen Segen mir und uns verleihen.

ויהי נעם יי אלהינו עלינו ומעשה ידינו כננה עלינו ומעשה ידינו כננהו

Und die Huld Gottes sei uns zugewendend, dass unserer Hände Arbeit sich befestige. Unserer Hände Werke befestige und kräftige und begründe Du, Herr und Vater. Amen.

ANTRITTSREDE SINAI GEMEINDE, CHICAGO

Trost den Trauernden, statt Asche
Pracht, statt Wehmuth Wonne, statt
Entmuthigung Ruhmesumhüllung!
(Jes. LXI, 3).

MEINE geliebte Gemeinde! Zum ersten Male trete ich heute in Deine Mitte, um Dir Gruss und Segen zu bringen im Namen des Gottes allen Geistes! Deinem ehrenvollen Rufe folgend, bin ich hiehergekommen, heute den Bund des Geistes und des Herzens, den Bund der Liebe und der Wahrheit, den Bund des Glaubens und der Gotteserkenntniss mit dir zu schliessen und durch das lebendige Wort zu besiegn. Aber unter welchen Eindrücken, in welcher ganz anderer Seelenstimmung, als ich gehofft und gewünscht hatte, trete ich heute mein Predigeramt an! Ist das die stolze, volkreiche Stadt, der Ruhm der Nation, die Königin des amerikanischen Westens? O dass ich sie also erblicken muss—trauernd in Asche und Staub, ihre Krone zu Boden geschleudert, ihre Prachtbauten in Ruinen, ihre belebten Handelsstrassen verwüstet, ihre schönsten Theile verödet—ein Bild des Grauens und des Entsetzens! Ihre strebsamen, unternehmungs-reichen Bürger so schwer darnieder geworfen von der Wucht eines grimmigen Missgeschicks, der durch langjährigen Fleiss aufgehäufte Reichthum von Tausenden und aber Tausenden zertrümmert! Und unsere Glaubensgenossenschaft, die sich unter den Bürgern der Stadt einen so ansehnlichen Platz errungen, welcher empfindlicher Schlag hat sie getroffen, wie musste sie mit den gesegneten Werkstätten ihres vielseitigen Berufsfleisses, auch so viele Wohnhäuser, die Zeugen reichen Familienglücks, und so viele Gottgeweihte Häuser der Andacht, der Belehrung und der Wohlthätigkeit in Rauch und Flammen aufgehen sehen! Auch Du, liebe Gemeinde, hast aus dem bitteren Kelch des Leidens in starken Zügen trinken müssen. Viele Deiner Familien, edle und geachtete Namen tragend, sind von dem unbarmherzigen Element weggejagt worden

vom theuren heimathlichen Herd, nur noch glücklich genug, das Leben der Lieben wie ein Scheit aus der Flamme retten zu können. Auch von Deiner Andachtsstätte bist du vertrieben, mussest auf fremdem Boden die Lieder Zion's singen und deinen Gott lobpreisen!

Meine Brüder und Schwestern! Ich theile Euren Schmerz, ich fühle mit Euch Euer Leid in der Tiefe meiner Seele. Ich finde es erklärlich, dass, statt strahlender Hoffnung, düsterer Ernst auf Eure Stirn sich lagert, dass ihr statt gehobenen Muthes, gesenkten Hauptes vor Gottes Antlitz hier erscheint. Aber ich will nicht, dass ihr sprecht: Wie sollen wir Gott Dank- und Loblieder singen, da unsre Seele wie eine Trauerharfe klingt und die Saiten unseres Herzens, zur Wehmuth gestimmt, nur von Klagetönen wiederhallen. Nein, Dank sei dem Höchsten, der mich zu Euch gesandt! Ich bin nicht zu Euch gekommen, um blos zu klagen mit den Klagenden und zu weinen mit den Trauernden. Ich fühle mich getragen von einem höheren Geist, von dem der trocknet alle Thränen und stillt alle Leiden und heilet alle Wunden und in den Wohlklang des Friedens und der Freude, in den Accord der Versöhnung auflöst alle Weh- und Jammerlaute, alle schrillen und grellen Misstöne des Lebens. Die Stimme Gottes ist's, die durch den heiligen Geist der Propheten in meinen Mund die Worte legt, die ich aus dem Buche Jesaias soeben verlesen habe, also lautend:

“Der Geist des Ewigen meines Herrn ruht auf mir, dieweil der Ewige mich geweiht hat, den Gebeugten Heil zu künden und mich gesandt hat, gebrochene Herzen zu verbinden, den Gefangenen Freiheit zuzurufen und den Gefesselten Erlösung, den Trauernden Zion's Trost darzureichen, Pracht statt Asche, Wonneöl statt Wehmuth, Ruhmesumhüllung statt Entmuthigung, dass man sie nenne Eichen der Gerechtigkeit, Pflanzung Gottes zur Verherrlichung, dass man wieder aufbaue alte Trümmer, wieder errichte Oeden der Vorzeit und verwüstete Städte auferstehen lasse. Fremde werden Eure Herden weiden und Ausländer eure Acker und Weinberge bestellen. Ihr aber werdet Priester des Ewigen genannt, Diener unsres Gottes—der Völker Schätze geniesset ihr und rühmet euch ihrer Herrlichkeit.”

DREIFACHE BOTSCHAFT HABE ICH EUCH NACH DES PROPHETEN
WORT ZU BRINGEN: HEIL DURCH DIE HOFFNUNG, TROST
DURCH DIE LIEBE UND FREIHEIT DURCH DEN GLAUBEN

I

Heilesbotschaft den Gebeugten durch die Hoffnung! Hoffnung ist die Feuersäule, die dem Unglücklichen leuchtet durch die Nacht bis zum Anbruch eines bessern Morgens. Hoffnung ist das Bundeszeichen des Himmels, das der verlassenen und gram-gebeugten Menschheit die Worte zuflüstert: Berge mögen wanken, Hügel mögen weichen, aber mein Bund wanket nicht und meine Gnade weicht nimmer, spricht der Ewige Dein Gott! Getrost sieht der Erdensohn die Sonne untergehen und den Himmel in Finsterniss sich einhüllen, lässt ihn die Hoffnung nur das wieder aufgehende Licht des andern Tages schauen. Mag der Sämann unter Thränen die Saaten in den kahlen Boden streuen, die Hoffnung führt ihn über Sturmgewölk und Schneegestöber hinan zu den rauschenden Aehren und den lachenden Fluren und erfüllt ihm die Brust mit Jubel. Die Hoffnung trägt den von Kummer schwer Belasteten auf ihren leichten Schwingen aus dem dunklen Schattenthal der Gegenwart in das schönere Reich der Zukunft. Hoffnung heisst der Stab, an dem ich Euch aufrichten will, Alle, die von des Schicksals Macht niedergeworfen worden. Das sei mein Führerstab, den ich hochhalten will, bis ihr gesiegt habt über alle Widerwärtigkeiten der Zeit.

Woher, sagen die Weisen in schöner Bilderrede, woher hat Moses seinen Stab genommen, mit dem er seine Wunder alle that, mit dem er die Fesseln des Druckes seinem Volke brach, mit dem er ihm den Durchgang bahnte durch des Meeres Wogen, mit dem er dem spröden Felsen Wasserströme entlockte, mit dem er die bitteren Wasser versüsste und den Kranken und am Leben schon Verzweifelnden Erfrischung und Genesung zuwehte? Das war ein Zweig vom Paradiesesbaume. Ihn hatte Gott dem ersten Menschen als Pilgerstab mitgegeben, als er ihn aus dem Garten der Wonne vertrieb und den Dornenpfad des Mühsals und der Beschwerde ihm eröffnete. Den Hoffnungsstab in der

Hand sollte der Mensch allen Fluch der Erde wieder in Segen umkehren. Ein Blatt von diesem Baume war's das die Taube dem Noah brachte, als abgenommen hatten die Wasser der Fluth—es war die wiederkehrende Hoffnung auf einen neuen Himmel und eine neue Erde.—Auf diesen Stab gestützt, wandelte Abraham Gott-vertrauend durch das Land, einer grossen Zukunft gewiss, die er in den Sternen gelesen hatte. Auf ihm schwang Joseph sich vom Kerker zum Throne auf. Ihn fand Moses im Garten Jethro's blühen und las darauf die Zeichen: Ich werde sein der ich bin, der Gott Deiner Zukunft! Da sprach er: Der Stab ist mein. Mit ihm, mit dem Hoffnungsstabe, bringe ich Heil meinem Volke.

Und mit diesem Mosesstabe haben die Gottesboten aller Zeiten das gesunkene Volk aufgerichtet und dem verschütteten Zion zugerufen: Auf, schüttele ab den Staub, wirf ab Dein Wittwenkleid, erglänze im bräutlichen Schmuck, strahlender denn je zuvor. Halt ein die Thränen, lass ab vom Weinen, Hoffnung ist da für Deine Zukunft, spricht Gott, und zurückkehren die Kinder zu ihrem Besitz! So riefen Israel's begeisterte Seher auf den rauchenden Trümmern Jerusalem's aus!

Nun denn—der Zweig vom Baume des Lebens blüht noch auch für Euch, aus den Ruinen auf den Gräbern Eurer Habe spriessen Euch Hoffnungssaaten! Hat das wilde Feuermeer denn Alles Euch verschlungen? Hat es nicht das Leben Euch geschont? Habt Ihr nicht die Träger Eurer schönsten Zukunfts-Hoffnungen, Eure Lieben, die Kleinodien Eures Hauses Euch gerettet? Ist nicht Eure Kraft, Euer vielerprobtes elastisches Streben, Euer Unternehmungsgeist, mit dem Ihr bis jetzt so Grosses geschaffen habt, Euch geblieben? Ist nicht Euer guter Name geblieben? Ist nicht das Zutrauen Eurer Brüder, die Liebe und das Wohlwollen der Menschheit unerschüttert und neu gekräftigt aus der Feuerprobe hervorgegangen?

Die Stadt ist in das Herz hinein getroffen. Wohl, es mag so sein, doch strömt nicht durch alle ihre Adern noch frisches kräftiges Leben? Bestehen nicht die grossen Verkehrswege noch, die Chicago zum Knotenpunkte des gewaltigen Eisenbahnnetzes machen, das die unermess-

lichen Länderstrecken vom Atlantischen bis zum Stillen Meere umspannt und den produktiven Westen und Süden mit dem industriellen Osten und Norden Amerikas verknüpft? Bleibt nicht die rührige Gartenstadt des Westens selbst in ihrer Verwüstung noch der Mittelpunkt, das Herz des gottgesegneten amerikanischen Landes?

Da habt Ihr den Stab des Lebens, da ist Saat zum Heile. Säet in Thränen und Ihr werdet in Freuden ernten! Geht mit Hoffnung gestärkt an das Werk des Wiederaufbaus Eures Glücks, Eurer Stadt und Eurer Gemeinde! Aus der Asche wird neue Pracht erblühen!

II

UND AUS DER WEHMUTH SOLL WONNE FLIESSEN. TROST

DURCH DIE LIEBE, LAUTET MEIN ZWEITES WORT

Es ist ein eigenthümlicher Trost, den die heilige Schrift uns darbietet in dem Spruch: Wen Gott liebt, den züchtigt er, und wie ein Vater dem Sohne, will er ihm wohl. Es wird uns kurzichtigen Menschen recht schwer, in den Schicksalsschlägen eine alllenkende Vaterhand zu erkennen. Doch fassen wir einmal den Vergleich des Bibelworts näher ins Auge. Auch das Kind mag die Ruthe nicht küssen, die es peinigt, noch die Hand an den Busen drücken, die es schlägt. Aber seht, wie es dem Kinde ergeht? So lange es denkt: Mein Vater will mich bloß fühlen lassen, wie viel stärker er ist als ich, damit ich ihm Gehorsam leiste, er herrscht mich an, aber was bleibt mir armen Kinde Anderes übrig als mich in die Launen meines Vaters zu fügen!—so lange das Kind also denkt, wird es die Schläge nie verschmerzen, nie mit seiner Lage, mit seinem Vater oder mit sich selber sich aussöhnen und zufrieden werden. Doch erhebt es sich zu der Einsicht: Mein guter Vater hat mir weh gethan; ich weiss, ihn schmerzt das Schlagen mehr noch als mich der Schlag, er hat aus wohlwollender Absicht mich gestraft, und nur mein Bestes stets im Auge—seht! da fühlt das Kindesherz sich nicht abgestossen vom Vaterherzen, sondern sich ihm mehr zugeneigt, es segnet den Vater, sieht zu, ob es ihm nicht mehr Wohlgefallen bereiten kann. So vermag schon die Ahnung der väterlichen Liebe

im Kindesherzen einen unversiegbaren Quell edler Entschlüsse zu berühren und zu öffnen. Und dasselbe Band der Liebe knüpft auch das Menschenherz an das grosse Vaterherz Gottes.

So lange der schwergeprüfte Sterbliche vom blinden Schicksal, vom Zufall oder von einer unbarmherzigen Naturkraft sich niedergebeugt sieht, wird er nie mit seinem Geschick sich versöhnen, nie seine Verluste verschmerzen, seine Qualen überwinden können und aufhören der höheren Macht zu zürnen, der gegenüber er sich so erbärmlich klein fühlet. Wahrlich, wollte die Herrschergewalt, die über den Sternen thronet, uns Staubgeborene bloß empfinden lassen, um wieviel die Hand, die Sonne und Sternenwelten zusammenhält und auflöst, mächtiger ist als die unsre, bloß um uns zu einem blinden Gehorsam zu zwingen,—unsre ganze innere Natur würde sich, wie in Hiob, gegen das göttliche Walten empören. Wir würden, wir müssten ihn herausfordern zum Kampf, den grossen Weltenlenker, und wenn er uns auch keine Rede stehe, wir müssten voll trotziges Ingrimm und voll Verzweiflung hinausstarren in's Weite—und keine Antwort tönte befriedigend in unsre oede Brust. Trostlos bliebe unsere Lage—wir hätten nicht Gott, wir hätten uns selbst betrogen um des Lebens schönsten Preis.

Empfinden wir jedoch in unsres Herzens tiefstem Grund, ein Vater waltet über uns, im Sturm und im Wetter brausender Geschehnisse erscheint uns noch ein Gott voll unendlicher Liebe und Güte, der Arm der väterlichen Vorsehung—der Vorsehung, die auch die menschlichen Versehen und Vergehen mit ihren Folgen in der Verkettung der Dinge zum Guten wendet, so haben wir die magische Kette auf der Hand, mit der wir uns aufschwingen können zu erneutem Leben und erhöhtem Glück, dann haben wir das Zauberwort gefunden, mit dem wir alle Leiden in Freuden, alle Trübsale in Labsale umkehren können. Ein jüdischer Weiser, erzählt die Sage, hatte ein Kästchen voll Edelsteinen dem Landesfürsten als Geschenk seines Volkes zu überbringen. Da wurde ihm unterwegs auf der Herberge vom Wirthe das Kästchen heimlich aufgebrochen und für die kostbaren Steine rohe Erde hineingelegt. Als er mit dem Kästchen

zum Fürsten kam und dieser es öffnete—siehe, da war nichts als Erde darin. Der Fürst erzürnte, hielt es für Spott, die Leute am Hofe erschrecken, aber der Weise fasste sich und sprach: O Fürst, ich kenne einen Spruch, durch den ich diesen Erdenstaub in Gold, Kiesel in Edelsteine verwandeln kann, einen Spruch, mit dem man Waffen aus dem Boden graben kann, auf dem man unterlegen, um von Neuem über die Feinde zu triumphiren. Mit ihm kannst du längst aufgegebene Länder mit all ihren Schätzen wiedererobern. Dieser Spruch heisst: Gam su letoba! Auch das ist zum Guten! Der Fürst erprobte des Weisen Spruch und er bewährte sich. Auch dem Weisen waren bald aus der rohen Erde Gold und Edelsteine hervorgegangen.

Des Weisen Loos ist auch Euer Loos, Geliebte. Auch Eure hochstrebende Stadt ist mitten auf ihrem Wege zur Grösse, mitten in ihrem Aufschwung zur Fürstin des Landes vom feindlichen Feuer ihrer grossen Schätze beraubt worden. Doch verzage nicht Chicago, und sprich wie jener Weise: Auch das ist zum Guten und es muss zum Guten werden! Aus Deiner Erde werden neue Edelsteine, aus Deinem Schutt neuer Schmuck erstrahlen.

Ja, es ist zum Guten! Chicago, die schöne Schöpfung des amerikanischen Volksgeistes, wurde mit dem Wahlspruch des Amerikaners: Jeder Sorge für sich selbst! Rasch und Kühn aufgebaut. Es trachtete nur Jeder die Grundlagen seines Wohlstands so rasch als möglich aufzurichten. Es wollte Einer dem Andern zuvorkommen, das Glück zu erjagen. So entstand auf dem weiten Strande des Michigansees durch den Wetteifer tausend fleissiger Hände und Geister die herrliche Stadt. Jedoch man übersah die Gefahr der Ueberstürzung, man liess unbeachtet die Verantwortlichkeit für das Leben und die Sicherheit Anderer und Aller. Die ewig denkwürdige Katastrophe muss und wird eine reiche Fundgrube guter Lehren, eine Quelle von Sicherheitsmassregeln und Vorsichtsmahnungen für die Zukunft werden. Das Chicago von gestern war auf Selbstsorge aufgebaut, das Chicago von morgen wird auf Gemeinwohl und Gemeinsorge aufgebaut werden. Das Chicago von gestern glänzte durch Ueppigkeit, durch verschwenderischen Luxus und genussüchtigen Leichtsinn,

das Chicago von morgen wird durch Bescheidenheit und Genügsamkeit, durch Mässigkeit und Bedachtsamkeit glänzen. Das Chicago von gestern war durch Selbstsucht gross geworden, das Chicago von morgen wird durch Liebe gross werden. Geläutert von allen Schlacken, wird es aus dem Schmelzofen der Prüfung hervorgehen!

Ja es ist zum Guten! Wie wurde doch diese emporblühende Weltstadt von allen ihren Nebenbuhlerinnen mit Neid und scheeler Missgunst verfolgt, und zahlte sie nicht mit gleicher Münze zurück! Die ist plötzlich in Noth und Unglück gerathen—sie braucht nicht zu bitten, es schweigt aller Neid, alle Missgunst, aller Zwiespalt; alle kleinlichen Leidenschaften treten zurück, alle Städte Amerikas eilen zur Hülfe, nur von einem Geist beseelt, vom Gott der Liebe. Keine Spaltung zwischen Süden und Norden, keine Kluft zwischen Eingeborenen und Adoptivbürgern, keine Unterscheidung zwischen Katholiken und Protestanten, zwischen Juden und Christen—aller Partei- und Sectengeist schwindet, es gibt nur Menschen, nothleidende und helfende Menschenbrüder. Die ganze Menschheit fühlt den Schlag, der die eine Stadt getroffen, der Schmerz des einen Glieds durchzuckt mit elektrischer Kraft alle Glieder der grossen Menschengesellschaft. Eisenbahn und Telegraph haben die Bande engergeflochten um die Erdenwelt. Die Menschheit ist eins geworden—ein grosses sittliches Ganzes, und von allen Ländern und Zungen schallt es wieder: Sind wir nicht Söhne eines Vaters? Hat uns nicht Ein Gott geschaffen, warum soll Bruder gegen Bruder lieblos handeln?

Ja, es ist zum Guten, und die Gaben, die Du empfängst von Deinen Schwestern, von der Nation, Deiner Mutter, von der ganzen Welt, hundertfach wirst Du sie zurückzahlen, Du bist nicht verworfen, nicht verstossen von Gott ob Deiner Sünden, edle Stadt! Wie der Töpfer nur an das starke Thongeschirr schlägt, um den festen hellen Klang des widerstrebenden Thons zu erproben vor den Ohren des Käufers, während er wohlweislich das schwache leicht gebrechliche Geschirr schonet, so hat die göttliche Vorsehung Dich heimgesucht, um Deine Festigkeit, Deine Widerstandskraft, Deinen unbesiegbaren Unternehmungsgeist zu erproben und zu stählen. So erhebe Dich und sprich mit

dem heiligen Sänger: Gezüchtigt hat mich Gott, doch nicht dem Tode preisgegeben. Ich sterbe nicht, ich lebe und erzähle noch von den Wunderthaten Gottes, von den Riesenthaten des Menscheistes!

III

UND AN DICH, LIEBE GEMEINDE, ERGEHT MEIN DRITTES,
MEIN SCHLUSSWORT. ES HEISST:

ZUR FREIHEIT DURCH DEN GLAUBEN

Der Gefesselte, der im Kerker schmachtet, sagt ein alter Spruch, kann nicht durch die eigene Kraft sich aus der Gefangenschaft befreien. Ihm sind ja Hand und Fuss gebunden, wie kann er die Glieder regen und sich loswinden von den drückenden Ketten, wenn nicht von aussen eine Hand da ist, die sie löset? Und ebensowenig kann der von Leiden oder von Leidenschaften gebundene und zu Boden geschmiedete Mensch seiner Bürde sich entledigen, ohne dass der schmachtenden Seele eine höhere Kraft zur Hülfe kommt, ihre Bande zu zerreißen. Der höhere göttliche und seiner Göttlichkeit bewusste Geist muss abschütteln die Ketten der Erdenlust und Erdenlast, die Bande des Missmuths und des Uebermuths. Es muss das Ich, das eigene Selbst aus seiner engen Sphäre heraustreten und einem höheren Ich, einem höheren Willen sich unterordnen. Und das ist das Ziel der Religion die das Wort Freiheit mit göttlicher Schrift eingräbt in die Tafeln jedes Menschenherzens. Der Glaube an eine höhere Bestimmung und an eine bestimmende höhere Macht, der Glaube an den göttlichen Menschenberuf und den berufenden Gott—das ist die die Menschheit erlösende Kraft. Ob Reichtum oder Armuth, Noth oder Wohlstand Euer Loos ist, ihr seid Diener Gottes, Arbeiter in der grossen Werkstätte der Menschheit und Gott Euer Meister und Auftraggeber! Ob die Lebensgüter reichlich oder karg Euch zugemessen sind—Ihr müsst Euer Tagewerk vollbringen, und Ihr müsst an jedem Ruhe- und Rasttage mit Eurer Wochenarbeit vor Gottes Antlitz erscheinen, bei Ihm Lohn und Segen, frischen Muth und neue Kraft Euch zu holen. Hat Euch Gott Euer Herr aus

der schönen Werkstätte Eures bisherigen Schaffens in eine andere verwiesen, wo Ihr schwerere Proben von Thatkraft und Ausdauer abzulegen habt,—nun so versucht Euer Bestes und strebt dem Meister zu gefallen. Wollt Ihr murren? Wollt Ihr die Arbeit Ihm kündigen? Das Leben fristen müsst Ihr doch. Wollt Ihr arbeiten, ohne ihn als Euren Meister anzuerkennen? Ohne an jedem Feiertag mit Eurer gethanen Arbeit Ihn zu begrüßen und Segen und Erquickung beim Ihm zu holen? Welche Thorheit wäre das! Jetzt erst recht, spricht Euer guter Geist zu Euch, jetzt erst recht lasst uns Muth und Hoffnung schöpfen bei Ihm, der Euch bessere Zeiten verheisset.

Ihr seid Priester Gottes! Wollt Ihr trauernd sitzen und klagen und den Dienst des Heiligthums unterbrechen, weil schwere Verstimmung sich Eurer bemächtigt, weil ein Feuer vom Himmel Euch Haus und Hab' verschlungen? Könnt Ihr das erhebende Wort, das Gott zu Aaron und seinen übergebliebenen Söhnen sprach, als ein Feuer vom Himmel die blühenden Priesterjünglinge Nadob und Obihu verzehrt hatte? "Durch die, die mir nahe sind, will ich geheiligt werden und vor dem ganzen Volke geehrt werden. Ihr sollt Euer Haupthaar nicht wild wachsen lassen und Eure Kleider nicht zerreißen und dem Tode Euch nicht hingeben. Eure Brüder, das ganze Haus Israel soll beweinen den von Gott angezündeten Brand. Ihr aber sollt vom Heiligthum nicht weichen und dem Tode Euch nicht hingeben, denn die Weihe des lebendigen Gottes ist auf Euch!" Nun, Ihr seid ein Reich von Priestern, ein heiliges Volk, fort mit der Klage, fort mit der Trauer und Verstimmung! Dienet Gott mit Freude! Ehret Ihn durch Ergebung! Heiligt Ihn durch Vertrauen und Demuth! Was sind Güter der Erde, Gold und Silber? Sie haben Flügel und fliegen davon. Sprechet: Was ich auch verloren, Gott habe ich im Himmel und was brauche ich mehr auf Erden! Nun erst zeigt, dass Ihr reich seid, reich genug um Opfer bringen zu können im Heiligthum Eurem Gott, Opfer der Liebe der leidenden Menschheit! Nun erst zeigt, dass Ihr frei seid und Euch loswinden könnt aus den Banden des Mühsals und der Geschäftssorge, um Stunden und Tage heiliger Rast widmen und weihen zu können, Eurem besseren Selbst, Eurer

Geistes- und Herzenspflege, Eurer eigenen und Eurer Kinder Belehrung und Veredlung. Durch die, die mir nahe sind, spricht Gott zum Hause Israel, seinem Priestervolke, will ich geheiligt und vor dem ganzen Volke geehrt werden!

So fasse ein Herz, meine liebe Gemeinde, heilige Priester-genossenschaft. Ich will Dir voranziehen mit dem Schild der Wahrheit und des Rechts auf der Brust. Die *Urim wetumim*, das Licht der Vernunft und des Glaubens, die Wahrheit des Geistes und des Gemüths in innigem Verein sollen die Gottesstimmen mir sein, deren Offenbarungen ich mit jedem Sabbat und Festtage Euch verkunden will in unbeugsamer Treue und mit unerschrockenem Freimuth. Und die Namen aller Söhne Israels will ich auf meinem Herzen tragen, die Namen aller meiner Gemeindemitglieder, alle Eure Leiden und Freuden theilend und Weihend und Euch mit Eurem Gott versöhnend. Neu anzufachen will ich die Flamme auf dem Altare Eures Heiligthums, neu anzünden das Licht der Religion, damit sie nimmer verlöschen. Schaffet Ihr nur herbei das heilige Oel Eurer Begeisterung und entzieht mir nicht die Lampen, Eure Herzen und die Herzen Eurer Kinder! Wohlan, schaalet Euch mit Eurem Glaubensmuth, mit Liebe und Hoffnung um unsere heilige Sinaifahne. Statt Entmuthigung Ruhmesumhüllung. Gott hat uns gedemüthigt, Er wird uns auch zu Hülfe stehen. Wir wollen Ihn anrufen in der Enge, Er wird uns antworten in der Weite, in der Erhebung!

GEBET

Wir danken Dir, dass Du Deine Hand schützend ausgebreitet über unser Leben und zum Verderber gesprochen hast: Haus und Gut sei in Deiner Hand, doch die Seelen greif nicht an! O so lass uns Vertrauen schöpfen aus Deiner Gnadenfülle und aus den wogenden Sorgen und Schrecken uns flüchten zu Dir, Hort des Lebens! Auf Dich mögen alle Betrübten ihre Bürden werfen und leichter tragen! Wirf Du das Rettungsseil der Hoffnung Allen zu, die Schiffbruch gelitten im stürmischen Feuermeere. Leuchte Du Allen, die ziellos umhersteuern auf den Wellen des Lebens, mit dem Leitstern Deiner Verheissung voran, dass sie rasch

einlenken können in die sichere Bucht! Lass Allen, denen der Himmel umwölkt ist, die Sonne des Heils erstrahlen!

Segne, o Herr, diese Stadt und lass sie neu aus den Ruinen erblühen und wie Silber das von den Schlacken gereinigt und wie Gold das im Schmelztiegel geläutert wird, schöner aus dem Feuer erstehen!

Segne alle Bewohner der Stadt und alle die Recht und Wahrheit pflegen und des Elenden und Darbenden liebevoll sich annehmen!

Segne die Genossenschaft Israels, Dein heiliges Erbe, segne diese Gemeinde mit allen ihren Schwestergemeinden, ihren Beamten und Führern!

Segne den Bund, den ich heute mit dieser Gemeinde geschlossen und lass mich ihr treuer Führer sein! Gleich Deinem Diener Moses lass mich ihr Deine Stimme zuerst künden aus dem lodernden Dornbusch am Sinai, der brannte, doch nicht verbrannte, um ihnen ein schöneres Ziel zu verheissen für die Zukunft. Lass mich ein Tröster sein Deinem Volke, ein Friedensbote Deiner Gemeinde, ein Heilsverkünder den Betrübten und Gedrückten!

Segne, o Gott, die ganze Menschheit mit dem Priestersegen:

Gott segne Dich und behüte Dich! Gott lasse sein Antlitz Dir leuchten und sei Dir gnädig! Gott wende sein Antlitz Dir zu und gebe Dir Frieden!

Amen.

DIE PRINZIPIEN UND ZIELE DES REFORM-JUDENTHUMS

FREUDIG gehoben vom Anblick dieser grossen und edlen Gemeinde, die ihre Leitung vertrauensvoll in meine Hände gelegt hat, und erfüllt von Dank gegen Gott für das mir beschiedene Glück, den bisherigen gefeierten Führer als väterlichen Rath und Mahner zur Seite zu haben, betrete ich diese ruhmgekrönte Kanzel, um von nun an als Verkünder des Gottesworts, als Priester der Wahrheit und des Friedens hier zu wirken. Nicht soll kleinmüthige Furcht und Bangigkeit meine Brust beklemmen beim Vergleich meiner geringen Kraft mit der Schwere und Verantwortlichkeit meines neuen Amtes oder mit den seltenen Gaben meines allverehrten Vorgängers. In Demuth, aber gepaart mit froher Zuversicht, will ich sogleich heute dem Drang meines Herzens folgend die glorreiche Fahne entfalten, die ich im Kampfe für Gott und Wahrheit, für Judenthum und Menschenhoheit vor Euch einhertragen will auf der bisher von Euch betretenen Siegesbahn, dieselbe Fahne, mit der das moderne Judenthum die Höhen der Zeit erstürmt hat und auf der die Flammenworte strahlen: "Gott ist mein Panier" ג' ד' נסִי Ja, um sogleich bei meinem Amtsantritt Zeugniß davon abzulegen, dass dieselben Lehren und Wahrheiten, die von dieser Stätte aus einen so beredten Dolmetsch gefunden, auch mein Inneres als heilige Ueberzeugung durchglühen und als Leuchte mir auf meinen Wegen dienen, will ich heute am 150sten Geburtstage unseres unsterblichen Moses Mendelssohn die Prinzipien und Ziele des Reformjudenthums zum Gegenstand meiner Betrachtung machen; dagegen gedenke ich am nächsten Sabbath in meiner englischen Antrittsrede Ueber das Judenthum und die jüdische Kanzel zu sprechen.

Israel, sagt ein jüdischer Dichter und Denker, Israel ist das Herz der Menschheit. Das Wohl und Weh der ganzen Welt durchzuckt es mit süsser Wonne oder bohrendem

Schmerz. Auf seinen Saiten tönet der Völker Jubel und Jammer wieder. Und was hat dieses mitfühlende Herz nicht schon empfunden, mit den Nationen gefrohlockt und gelitten! Israel's Geschichte ist die Weltgeschichte im Kleinen. Wundern wir uns, dass unser himmelstürmerisches Jahrhundert mit seinem Riesenkampf gegen Vernunft-Unterjochung und blinden Autoritätsglauben auch das Judenthum mit fieberhafter Unruhe erfüllt, dass der kühne Geist freier Forschung und Prüfung, der die auferlegten Fesseln und Bande der Vorzeit wie Spinngewebe von sich gerissen, mit seinem Simsonarm auch an den Säulen des jüdischen Gottestempels zu rütteln sich unterfangen hat. Wir stehen, —und nur Blinde und Stumpfsinnige sehen's nicht—an einem der grössten Wendepunkte der Zeiten. Unter gewaltigen Schwankungen und Zuckungen ringt sich ein neuer Himmel und eine neue Erde in's Dasein. Sollte Angesichts dieser weltumwälzenden Stürme, die unter dem Donner des göttlichen Weltgerichts das Mittelalter mit seinem Glaubens-Wahn und seiner Geistestyranei von der Erde wegfeigen, das Judenthum theilnahmslos dem grossen Entscheidungskampf zwischen dem Alten und dem Neuen zuschauen und, in seinem Schneckenhaus geborgen, warten, bis eine Wunderthat Gottes die tausendjährigen Ruinen Jerusalems wieder für es aufrichtet? Das vermeinte, das wollte und lehrt noch heute die ehrliche Orthodoxie. Aber sieh! Gottes Hand zerschlug das knöcherne Schneckenhaus. Die heranwogende Fluth neuer Ideen drang in's jüdische Lager und wie sie die Ghettomauern von aussen stürzte, untergrub sie auch die innern Wälle und Scheidewände des Juden. Wer nicht entschlossen und ruhig aus der bedrohten Enge in's weite, volle Menschenleben hinausstürmte, der ward zuletzt auf schwimmenden Trümmern, auf losgerissenen Planken ein haltloses Wrack, von den mächtigen Wässern hinausgespült in die wildbewegte Zeitströmung. Die frommen Alten hüllten sich immer tiefer in ihre Gebetsmäntel, über den traurigen Abfall verzweiflungsvoll die Hände ringend, aber unfähig, ihm einen Damm zu setzen. Wer hat da gleich Moses den Erlöserstab hoch geschwungen und durch die empörten Gewässer eine sichere Bahn geöffnet für die Träger des reinen Gottesglaubens? Wer hat in

dieser Zeit religiöser Oede und Bestürzung, gleich einem Elias, Feuer vom Himmel herabbeschworen und die erloschene Gluth auf dem Gottesaltare neu angefacht, dass das Volk sich wieder beugen lernte vor dem Einzig-Einen? Wer hat mit der Wundergewalt eines Elischa das todtgegläubte junge Israel mit neuem Odem durchweht und zur Mutter gesprochen: "Sieh! Dein Kind lebt!?" Wer hat mit der prophetischen Kraft eines Ezechiel den Flügelschlag des Geistes vernommen, der die welken Gebeine mit neuer Lebensgluth beseelte und das Volk aus dem modererfüllten Grab zu verjüngtem Dasein weckte? Wer hat mit dem Trostruf des grossen Exilspropheten den umflorten Blick der trauernden Wittwe vom rauchenden Aschenhaufen des Salomonischen Tempels zu dem in viel herrlicherem Glanz erstrahlenden, Völker-verbrüdernden Zion der Zukunft hingelenkt? Oder wer hat mit dem Eifer der Hasmonäer das Heer der Gottesstreiter von Neuem um das alt-heilige Banner geschaart und das Gotteshaus mit neuen schmetternden Weisen, neuem Sang und Klang erfüllt? Wer hat das in den Winkel geworfene Diadem der Gotteslehre mit neuem Glanz ausgestattet und es zum Mittelpunkt und zur Krone der Jugenderziehung gemacht? Wer hat, mit einem Wort, das moderne Judenthum geschaffen, das seinen Siegeseinzug in der gebildeten Welt gehalten?

Kein Anderer als das Reformprinzip, das die Messiashoffnung des Judenthums zu einem weltumspannenden idealen Ziele erhob, dessen verklärender Lichtstrahl den ganzen Dornenpfad, die thränenreiche Exilsnacht des Duldevolkes erhellt und die grossen Kämpfe und Errungenschaften nicht blos Israels, sondern seiner beiden Töchter-Religionen als Vorbereitungen für seine künftige Grösse und Herrlichkeit erscheinen lässt. Der Gedanke des fortschrittlichen Judenthums allein hat uns das Bewusstsein einer erhabenen Mission, die Siegeszuversicht und Anwartschaft auf eine unvergleichlich grosse Zukunft gegeben, die uns keine Kulturströmungen und keine Modephilosophie der Zeit mehr rauben kann. Das Judenthum ist die Religion der Zukunft! Nicht der Wiederherstellung des von Opferblut triefenden Priesterheiligthums mit all den levitischen Reinheits- und Speisegesetzen, sondern

dem Aufbau des grossen Gottestempels im Herzen der Menschheit steuern wir zu! Das ward vor 40 Jahren der Rettungsruf der auf deutschem Boden erblühten Reform inmitten der Bestürzung ob des geborstenen alten Religionsgebäudes.

Nun, aber ist das Judenthum durch diese Reformbewegung wirklich gerettet worden? Hat sie nicht die durch Jahrtausende geheiligte Religion aus ihrer stillen Zurückgezogenheit auf den Kampfplatz der Zeitideen, vor den Richterstuhl des Zeitgeistes geschleppt und dadurch ihr ehrwürdiges Ansehen geschmälert? Hat sie nicht durch den angeregten Läuterungsprozess allmählig Alles in Fluss, Alles in's Rollen gebracht, so dass Nichts, auch nicht das für unverrückbar Gehaltene, das Allerheiligste unangetastet an seiner Stelle geblieben? Hat sie nicht durch die Berufung auf die Vernunft als letzte Instanz in Sachen des Glaubens den eigenen Geschmack und Machtspruch eingeräumt und zur rücksichtslosesten Willkür und Neuerungssucht, ja, wie wir heute sehen, zur Gottesleugnung und zur förmlichen Lossagung von den Lehren des Judenthums geführt? Das ist die ernste grosse Folge, die ich beantworten, der schwere Vorwurf, dem ich begegnen will. Und ich thue das mit dem eben verlesenen Bibelworte, das da lautet:

ואני זאת בריתי אותם אמר ד' רוחי אשר עליך ודברי אשר שמתי בפיך לא ימוש מפיך ומפי זרעך ומפי זרע זרעך ומעתה ועד עולם.

“Und Mein Bund ist dies mit ihnen, spricht Gott: Mein Geist, der auf Dir ruht, und Meine Worte, die ich in Deinen Mund gelegt habe, dass sie nicht weichen aus Deinem Munde und dem Mund Deiner Kinder und Kindeskinde von nun an bis in Ewigkeit.” Hier ist der Markstein, der untrügliche Leitstern unserer Reformbestrebungen.

Die Zeit des Exils, in der unser Prophet lebte, war genau besehen von nicht minder schweren, weltumwälzenden Ereignissen bewegt, als die unsere. Die grossen Völkerkolosse, Babylon und Egypten, stürzten vor dem Anprall neuer Volksmächte und begruben das graue Alterthum mit seiner Hoheit, seiner zaubervollen Weisheit und Kunst unter ihren Trümmern. Und in diesen Grabgesang der Nationen,

in dieses Sterbegeläute der Heiden-Götter mischte der göttliche Seher seinen Jubelruf über Israel's Auferstehung. Ein Bund besteht zwischen Himmel und Erde, ruft er, und wie über dem regengepeitschten Erdball der siebenfarbige Friedensbogen Zeugniss gibt vom goldenen Sonnenlicht hinter dem Wolkendunkel, so wird Israel mit verjüngter Kraft hervorstrahlen, um von Gott zu zeugen, der Himmel und Erde geschaffen! Ein Bund besteht zwischem Gott und der Menschheit, und wenn am grossen Schöpfrad der Zeiten die Völker wie Tropfen am Eimer schwebend auf- und abwärtsschnellen, wie Wellen im Meere steigen und versinken, Israel, der Gottesbote, geht nicht unter, so wenig wie die Gottesbotschaft, sondern führt den Zug als Menschheitspriester, bis der Gottesberg von Allen erstiegen. Und von der Unverletzlichkeit dieses Gottesbundes mit der Natur und der Menschheit, von der Untrüglichkeit dieser Verheissung durch Israel an die Völker will das Reformjudenthum heute inmitten des Zusammensturzes der bisherigen Weltanschauung, inmitten des gegenwärtigen Verfalls der Autoritäten von Neuem laut und unverholen Zeugniss geben. Nicht die Anflösung, sondern die Wiedergeburt, nicht das nahe Ende, sondern die Unsterblichkeit des Judenthums haben wir auf unsere Fahne geschrieben.

Eine altindische Sage erzählt von einem gewaltigen Riesenfürsten, der der Gottheit ewigen Trotz geschworen hatte und jede Gottesverehrung mit der Wurzel von der Erde zu vertilgen bemüht gewesen war. Nur sich allein wollte der Stolze ob seiner grenzenlosen Macht und Kühnheit auf seiner schwindelnden Höhe in seinem von nie gesehener Pracht funkelnden Palaste angebetet sehen. Der Name der Gottheit durfte nicht mehr genannt, der ewigen Vergessenheit sollte er heimgegeben werden. Doch der Tyrann hatte ein Söhnlein, zart und lieblich, das verräth ihm, da es spielend auf seinem Schosse sass, tiefe Verehrung für die Gottheit, von deren Dasein keines Menschen Zunge ihm die Kunde gebracht hatte. Nichts half es dem zornstammenden Vater, den Knaben zu schelten und zu geisseln. Weder Mahnungen noch Drohungen, weder Verstossung noch Folterqualen konnten den Drang nach dem Unsichtbarhohen in seiner Brust ersticken. Das gezückte Henkers-

schwert, der lodernde Holzstoss und der von Ungeheuern wimmelnde Abgrund waren nicht stark genug, um ihm den Gedanken Gott aus dem Herzen zu reissen. Bestürzt und zerknirscht sah der Gottesfeind sein Werk vereitelt. Unter seines Sohnes Herrschaft schlug die Gottesfurcht neue Wurzel im weiten Land.

Das ist das Schicksal unseres verwegen gegen Gott sich auflehrenden Zeitalters. Vergeblich sind all die Bemühungen, die Gottesschrift am Firmament auszulöschen, den Namen des Meisters zu verleugnen, der Ring an Ring an der grossen Schöpfungskette und Rad an Rad in der endlosen Himmelswerkstatt gefügt, die rastlos durch die Aeonen schafft und wirkt. Der Sternkundige, der aus der Störung des Gleichmasses des Planetenlaufs das Auftauchen eines neuen Himmelskörpers jubelnd ankündigt, und der Chemiker, der aus einem Schatten in seinem Farbenprisma das Auffinden eines neuen Urstoffs freudig begrüsst, wem anders zollen sie ihre Huldigung, als dem All-Regenten, der der Natur untrügliche Gesetze gegeben? Wie in den neuaufgegrabenen Tempeln zu Babylon jeder einzelne Ziegelstein den Namen Nebuchadnezar's an der Stirne trägt, so zeugt jede unentdeckte Fussspur im Kreidefelsen und jedes Korallenhäuschen in der Meerestiefe, jeder Silberpunkt in der Milchstrasse und jedes Blatt im Kohlenbett von dem Weltenkönig, dem nur wahnbethörte Selbstanbeter die Huldigung verweigern. Fruchtlos ist das Streben, das Gottessiegel vom Menschenherzen abzulösen und den Mahnruf: Du sollst! und Du sollst nicht! ohne die Donnerstimme des majestätischen Rufers: "Ich bin's, der Ewige!" vernehmen zu lassen. Jedes Kindesgemüth, das für das Edle und Hohe in heiliger Lohe flammt und jedes Verbrecherherz, das vor seinem eignen Bilde zurückschaudert, straft die moderne Lehre Lügen, dass Sittlichkeit bloss eine weise Lebensversicherung der Gesellschaft, ein freiwillig geschlossener Tugendbund sei. Es ist das Urbild göttlicher Güte und Vollkommenheit, an dem unbewusst der Pessimist die ihn wenig befriedigende Wirklichkeit misst und dem der für Fortschritt schwärmende Menschenfreund in edlem Wirken nacheifert. Ja, Gottes Reich ist's an dem unablässig die Jahrhunderte der Weltgeschichte fortbauen. והיה אמונה

עתיך חסן חכמה ודעת יראת ד' היא אוצרי "Und der Zeiten Sicherheit beruht auf sittlichen und geistigen Schätzen, auf gesellschaftlicher Wohlfahrt wie auf Fortschritt im Können und Wissen, aber Gottesfurcht bleibt immer die Vorrathskammer." So lehrt das Judenthum, dessen Wahrheiten allein die Zeiten-, die Feuer- und Wasserprobe bestanden hat.

Nicht einen Zwiespalt will die Lehre Israels zwischen Wissen und Glauben, zwischen Geist und Gemüth, zwischen Himmel und Erde, zwischen der Welt da innen und da draussen, oder zwischen Mensch und Menschen, sondern einen Bund zwischen ihnen errichten und stets erneuern. Einheit, Ganzheit, Vollkommenheit mit Gott—das ist die Quintessenz des Judenthums. Und wie vor seinem Licht das die Welt zerklüftende Heidenthum wie Nebel zerfloss und der Thron offenbar ward, auf dem Gott der Einzige hoch und heilig waltet, kein starres regungsloses Gedankending der Philosophie, sondern ein lebendiger Gott, der sich liebend seiner Geschöpfe annimmt und den Seufzer jeder ringenden Seele hört und stillt, der Inbegriff höchster Wahrheit und unendlicher Güte—so ist der reine, volle Gottesgedanke für alle Zeiten Israel's Lebenssonne, der Mittelpunkt und Zweck seines Daseins. Wie es für ihn gestritten und gelitten, gelebt und geblutet hat durch die vergangenen Jahrtausende, so ist bei allen seinen staunenswerthen Leistungen und Errungenschaften auf allen Gebieten der Cultur die Wahrung, die Reinerhaltung und stete Vertiefung und Verinnerlichung der Gottesidee inmitten der wechselnden philosophischen oder mystischen Zeitströmungen sein hoher Priesterberuf. Und wie es auf der Gottesliebe als dem unerschütterlichen Felsengrunde das Gebot der Liebe zum Mitmenschen, dem göttlichen Ebenbild, aufgebaut und so der Humanität als denkbar höchste Lebensmaxime den Satz: Liebe deinen Nächsten wie dich selbst! und der Sittlichkeit das erhebende Ideal in dem Wort: Seid heilig, wie Gott heilig ist! aufgestellt hat, so hat es noch heute die Hoheit der Menschenwürde, den Gottesadel der Menschenseele, den unbefleckten Himmelsglanz der Schöpfungskrone gegen alle im Namen der Wissenschaft oder der Religion versuchten Entheiligungen zu schützen und zu vertheidigen. Wie es durch seine Messiashoffnung

der Menschheit ein leuchtendes Ziel, durch sein Sittengesetz eine sichere, heilige Ordnung, durch seinen Sabbath und sein Gebets- und Lehrhaus einen erhebenden Ruhe- und Sammelpunkt, durch sein Ehegesetz das Familienheiligthum, und durch seine Armengesetze das Bewusstsein gegenseitiger Verpflichtung gegeben hat, so wandert es noch, die Gesetzestafeln in der Hand, als Wächter des Gottesbundes der Menschheit voran, auf die ewigen Grundlagen aller Sittlichkeit hinweisend und die Völker zum Gottesberg hinangeleitend. Denn die Wahrheiten des Judenthums, sagt treffend der Midrasch, sind eine scharf geschliffene Schwertklinge, die Jeden gar leicht verwundet, der nicht wie Israel seine Kraft daran erprobt hat, ein reissender Strudel, der Jeden in seine Tiefe zieht, der nicht wie Israel die Fluthen zu bemeistern gelernt, und ein verzehrendes Feuer, das Jeden versengt, der nicht wie Israel durch dessen Gluthen unverehrt geschritten ist.

Und wer hat diese Wahrheiten aus der Verdunkelung an's Licht gezogen? Wer hat die vom Rost der Zeiten entstellte Gottesschrift wieder leserlich gemacht als Reform? Die Strenggläubigkeit steckte mit der Klugheit des Strausses furchtsam das Haupt in den Sand vor dem heranbrausenden Zeitgeist freien Denkens und Forschens. Die Reform bewillkommnete den vor den Jerichomauern stehenden Kriegsmann als Gottesboten und Freund, als Bundesgenossen im Kampf für den Einen Gott und die Eine Menschheit. Die frommen Alten jammerten über den Einsturz der Schutzwälle und Scheidemauern; die Reform begrüßte ihn als den Siegeseinzug der menschenverbrüdernden jüdischen Heilslehre in der Welt. Die Orthodoxie verzweifelte ob des Trotzes des jüdischen Volkes, das nicht mehr aus den ranzigen Schläuchen der Wüstenwanderer, aus den gesprungenen Cisternen, in die die Jahrtausende ihren Flugsand hineingeweht haben, das trübe abgestandene Wasser trinken wollte. Die Reform wies auf den ewig sprudelnden Quell der Gottesoffenbarung im Menschenherzen hin, aus dem die begeisterten Propheten und Psalmisten, die Gesetzgeber und Lehrer Israels, ja der Völker alle den Labetrunk für die dürstende Menschheit geschöpft haben, und an dem allein kommende Jahrtausende ihren Durst löschen können.

Denn, wie der Prophet in unserem Text, ruft sie: רוּחִי אִשָּׁר עליך Der Gottesgeist, der ruht im Wechsel und Wandel der Formen ewig auf Dir. Wie die Erde, ewig um die Sonne kreisend, Jahr um Jahr ihr Kleid wechselt, so bewegt sich die Menschheit, von Gott als der ewigen Geistessonne angezogen, fort, mit jedem Zeitalter neue Culturb Blüten, ihre Lebenserscheinungen und Anschauungen annehmend. Mag das neuentrollte Buch der Schöpfung uns viel grossartiger Gestaltungsepochen von Erde und Himmel enthüllen als die Bibelurkunde, es ist derselbe Schöpfergeist, der so traulich und so majestätisch aus der alten Rolle wie aus den nie alternden Schriftzügen uns entgegentritt. Mögen die biblischen und nachbiblischen Wundererzählungen alle in's Reich der Dichtung verweisen und die alten Vorstellungen von Offenbarung und Belohnung und Bestrafung von besserer Einsicht in's Natur- und Geisteswalten verdrängt werden—das viel grössere Wunder, dass der Erdensohn den Gedanken des Schöpfers nachzudenken und den Wegen des Weltenlenkers im freien Thatendrang nachzufolgen berufen ist, dass die himmlische Vorsehung jeden seiner Schritte leitet und die Gerechtigkeit jeden seiner Gedanken wägt, das vom Judenthum geoffenbarte Wunder der Vermählung des verwesenden Staubes mit dem Geist der Ewigkeiten, bleibt bezeugt von jedem Menschenleben ein unversiegbarer Quell des Trostes im Leiden, des Lichts in der Grabesnacht. Möge immer Furcht vor Hölle und Geissel den Menschen aufhören zu schrecken, er wird mit den Banden der Liebe zu Gott emporgezogen werden. Wie in den Tagen Ezechiels, wird derselbe Sturm, der die ehernen Götzenkolosse umwirft, das Gottesvolk mit verjüngter Frische aus dem Grabe wecken. Was thuts auch, wenn das praktische Leben mit den alten Formen, aus denen der Modergeruch begrabener Jahrhunderte uns entgegenweht, aufräumt, wenn die modernen Juden, die nicht heucheln und frömmeln wollen, die biblischen so gut wie die rabbinischen Ceremonien mit den Speise- und Reinheitsgesetzen als Ballast über Bord geworfen haben? Es ist der entseelte Leib, nicht der Geist des alten Judenthums, der zu Grabe getragen worden; es ist die dürre Schale, nicht der Kern, der weggeworfen, es ist die Priestertracht, nicht der Priesterberuf Israels, der damit

abgelegt worden ist. Was thut's, wenn die freie Bibel- und Religionsforschung uns den menschlichen Charakter der heiligen Schriften, die allmähliche Entstehung und Umgestaltung der jüdischen Institutionen alle nachweist? Um so mehr Begründung gewinnt die Reformidee die für das Judenthum innerhalb der freien Menschengesellschaft eine andere Erscheinungsform als für das Judenthum im Ghetto und das Judenthum in Kanaan's Land heischt.

Ja wir wollen für das ewige Herdfeuer der Religion nur neuen Brennstoff. Wir wollen Israel den Menschheitspriester im Zeitgewand, das Judenthum in anmuthiger zeitgemässer Hülle erscheinen lassen, ohne jedoch von der priesterlichen Heiligkeit des jüdischen Volkes und von der Unerlässlichkeit der Sabbath- und Festtage als der Träger des geschichtlichen jüdischen Geisteslebens auch nur um eines Haares Breite zu weichen.

Aber ganz besonders betont sie noch mit unserem Propheten die Erhaltung des geschichtlichen Stromes des Judenthums ודברי אשר שמתי בפיו לא ימוש מפיו ומפי זרעך das Israel übergebene Gotteswort darf nicht aus unsrem und unserer Kinder und Kindeskindern Mund weichen. Darauf kommt Alles an. Dahin Zielen, darin gipfeln alle unsere Reformbestrebungen. Um unserer Jugend willen haben wir die Räume unseres Gotteshauses, die Fugen und Winkel unseres Heiligthums mit neuem Licht und Glanz erfüllt. Um unsre Kinder und Kindeskindern zu Gottesstreitern, zu Vertheidigern unserer Burg, unseres heiligen Palladiums zu weihen, haben wir Synagoge und Schule, den Kultus und die Lehre verjüngt. Um sie mit dem Feuer jugendlicher Begeisterung für das altherwürdige Erbe der Väter, mit heisser Gluth der Liebe und der Hingebung für Israel's Lehre und Priestermission zu durchlodern, haben wir den Staub der Jahrhunderte von unserer Fahne abgeschüttelt, die morgenländische Tracht abgeworfen und die Sprache und Sitte unseres Geburts-Landes im Gotteshause eingebürgert.

Aber ach—wo sind die in der Freiheit geborenen und erzogenen Söhne und Töchter? Für sie haben wir den schweren Stein der Gesetzesübungen vom Gottesbrunnen weggewälzt; wo ist die durstige junge Heerde? Für sie haben

wir das Himmelsmanna von den wurmstichigen Ueberresten gereinigt; wo sind die Hungrigen, dass wir sie laben? Ach! hier ist der grosse Riss, den die Reform noch nicht zugeheilt, hier die traurige Oede, die unsere edlen Pioniere nicht angebaut haben. Was nützt der Erlösungsruf des Sabbath? Was der rauschende Orgelton und der erhebende Chorgesang? Und was das funkensprühende Kanzelwort, wenn in elende Knechtschaft versunken das junge Israel taub geworden gegen die Gottesstimme? Was nützt es, wenn gerade die freisinnige jüdische Geschichtsforschung den jüdischen Geist als Vater unserer gesamten Civilisation und die jüdische Religion als Mutter der modernen Sittenlehre erkannt hat, geblendet von einer zungenglatten Modephilosophie, stumpf gegen Israels Priesterberuf, kehrt die jüdische junge Welt dem Väterglauben den Rücken. Wie wollen wir die Jugend aus dem Schlamm der Sinnlichkeit, darin sie zu ersticken droht, zur ätherreinen Höhe der Gottesweihe, wie unser Volk aus dem Dunstkreis slavischer Genuss- und Habgier zum sonnenumstrahlten Sinaigipfels wahrer Menschenerlösung emporziehen? Wer soll das Gottesbanner hochhalten, wenn unsere Arme erschlaffen? Wer die Menschheit nach dem gelobten Lande des messianischen Ideals führen, wenn unsere Leiber in der Wüste dahin sinken? M. Fr. Nur das Judenthum, das nicht nach Mizraim's Fleisch- und Milchtöpfen, nach den Tempelruinen Jerusalems zurückblickt, sondern in der Gegenwart lebend, vertrauensvoll das Land der Zukunft erobern will, das *R e f o r m j u d e n t h u m*, das in Deutschland unter dem Schatten Mendelssohns seine wissenumrauschte Wiege, in Amerika aber seinen freien und ungehemmten Wirkungskreis hat, kann und muss die Führerschaft der jüdischen Gesammtheit übernehmen, unter dem alten Schlachtenruf: *הפרו חורתך עת לעשות לד'* 'Es ist Zeit für Gott zu handeln, denn sie haben deine Lehre, O Gott, gebrochen!'

Das Reformjudenthum muss im Laufe der Jahrzehnte angemessene, neue, religiöse Formen Geist und Gemüth anregende Bräuche schaffen, durch welche das Leben des Juden von der Wiege bis zum Grabe umspinnen und in den Dienst des jüdischen Gottesgedankens gezogen wird. Das jüdische Haus, das Familienleben, das frohe Sabbath-mahl,

die Familienfeste müssen von den Heimathsklängen vom Euphrat und Jordan, vom Tajo und Ebro neu ertönen. Das jüdische Selbstgefühl muss nicht von Aussen durch ergrautes Vorurtheil, sondern von Innen durch fromme häusliche Erziehung und glühende Begeisterung für Israels Wundergang durch die Jahrtausende geweckt und genährt werden. Nicht blos der Lehrer und Rabbiner, alle Söhne und Töchter Israels müssen mit den unvergleichlichen Schöpfungen, Kämpfen und Errungenschaften des Jüdischen Volkes vertraut sein, um, wie jüngstens unser Nestor von dieser Stätte aus gethan, mit Stolz ausrufen zu können: "Ich bin ein Jude!" Getaucht in den Feuerstrom des jüdischen Geisteslebens, werden sie dann unverwundbar, gleich jenem griechischen Helden, den Anfechtungen des Zeitgeistes und der Sünde trotzen können. Namentlich aber darf die Jugend nicht mit dem Moment der Confirmationsweihe, wenn sie gerade zum selbstständigen Gedankenflug die schwachen Geistesschwinger auszubreiten beginnen, in die Wüste ein Opfer dem Asaselgott Mammon hinausgesandt werden. Sie darf sich nicht den Einflüssen und Obliegenheiten der Religion, der Schule und der Synagoge entziehen, bis wir sie als Männer und Frauen in die Mitgliederzahl unserer Gemeinde gereiht haben. Nur erst wenn Haus, Schule und Synagoge ihren dreifachen Segenskreis wie die drei israelitischen Lagerringe in der Wüste, um das Leben der jüdischen Gesamtheit gezogen haben, ist die Zukunft unser, ist der Sieg gewonnen!

Sollen wir nun vor der Benützung der einzigen freien Zeit in der Woche, die uns zu Gebote steht, des bürgerlichen Ruhetags, für diese Bestrebungen, die Jugend uns zu gewinnen und zu erhalten, zurückschrecken, weil die Verdächtigung und Verleumdung ihren Giftzahn daran wetzt? Oder aus Furcht, wie sie von jeher die thatenschwache Orthodxie gezeigt hat? Alle die Gegner eines wochentägigen, namentlich periodischen, Sonntagsgottesdienstes erinnern mich an jene der beiden Frauen, die vor dem Richterstuhl Salomos lieber wünschte, dass das lebende Kind zertheilt, als dass es ihrer Gegnerin zugestanden werde. Nicht aus Liebäugelei gegen das Chistenthum, das im Reformprinzip seinen tödtlichen Gegner wohlweislich erkennt, sondern aus

heissinnigster Liebe zum Judenthum befürworten wir eine periodische Sonntagandacht mit Herz und Geist anregenden Vorträgen, um so schärfer und entschiedener jedoch auf die Erhaltung und Hebung des Sabbathgottesdienstes und die häusliche Familienfeier am Freitag Abend dringend.

Gerade unserer unwissenden und darum so leicht irregeleiteten Jugend gilt es, die kostbaren Gedankenschätze des Judenthums aus dem tiefen Schacht seiner Vergangenheit hervorzuholen und mit ihrem echten Demantenglanz den gleissnerischen Schein, der Tagesweisheit zu vergleichen. Erkennen und einsehen soll unsere Jugend, wie unser gereiftes Geschlecht, dass das Judenthum nicht von einer Zeitströmung wie der Strom von einem Binnenmeer, verschlungen wird und nicht wie ein Steppenfluss im Sande verrinnt, sondern dem majestätischen König der Ströme gleicht, der vom Urgebirge der Vorzeit hervorquellend seine durch steten Zufluss der Bäche wachsenden Fluthen fortwälzt, bis das Weltmeer erreicht ist. Ja, nur wenn Gotteserkenntniss, wie sie aus dem jüdischen Heiligthum sich ergossen, die Erde bedeckt und das Menschenleben zum Ocean geworden, darin Gottesmajestät in Klarheit sich abspiegelt, dann ist unsere Sendung vollbracht.

Das sind die Grundwahrheiten und Ziele des Reformjudenthums, für die ich in Deiner Mitte, geliebte Gemeinde, wirken und streben will zur Ehre Gottes und zur Ehre Israels. Schenket Ihr mir, liebe Freunde, Euer Vertrauen, Eure Liebe, damit ich, von Jedem von Euch unterstützt, in diesem herrlichen Gottesweinberg nur gute Saaten auf empfänglichen Boden streue und nur edle Früchte zeitigen sehe, damit der Menschen Wohlgefallen und Gottes Huld auf unserem Werke ruhen! Amen.

A PIONEER OF REFORM JUDAISM

DAVID EINHORN AND HIS PLACE IN AMERICAN JEWISH LIFE

THE tenth of November is a red letter day in modern history. It was the birthday of Martin Luther, the prime mover of the Reformation, of Friedrich Schiller, the great idealist among modern poets, and of Charles Darwin, the creator of a new era in science. It was also the natal day of David Einhorn. David Einhorn, the Jewish Reformer, combined the firmness of character of Luther, with the idealism of Schiller and the clear vision of Darwin, so as to become the Reform theologian par excellence, alongside of Abraham Geiger, the pioneer and historian, and of Samuel Holdheim, the radical. Possessed of a powerful personality, he was fearless and uncompromising in his adherence to principles. His was the ardor of an Elijah and the lofty eloquence of an Isaiah, but his life was one of continual trials and wanderings, as well as of incessant religious combats.

Born in 1809 in a little village in the vicinity of Fuerth, Bavaria, he attended the *Yeshibah* there under Rabbi Wolf Hamburger, the great Talmudist, to receive, in view of his great erudition, the *Hattorat Horaah* (the Rabbinical diploma) in his eighteenth year, but, as he came forth from the universities of Erlangen, Wuerzburg and Munich as a man of modern ideas, a 'Neologue,' as the reactionary Bavarian government called the liberal Rabbis, he was proscribed and persecuted by his fanatical teachers, and prevented by intrigues and denunciations from obtaining a position in his native state.

After ten years of disappointment and anguish, he at last received a call from a small Jewish community in the Grand Duchy of Oldenburg, where as Chief Rabbi of the parish, he succeeded in improving the religious and social life of the people. There he came into closer contact with the renowned Reform leaders and was thus induced to

enter the larger arena of Judaism. He soon took a prominent part in the great issues which divided German Jewry into two hostile camps. In the famous Geiger-Tiktin controversy he joined the sixteen liberal Rabbis in denouncing the league of orthodoxy which denied Abraham Geiger the title of Rabbi, on account of his free Biblical research, as being incompatible with the Talmud, and, with a voice which sounded like the roaring of a young lion reverberating through the forest, he cried forth: "The time when people feared your anathemas is past. We need such men as Geiger, who strive to separate the kernel from the shell, the pure gold of the Law from its dross. The Talmud cannot claim infallibility; it is but a vessel of divine truth, but not divine itself."

Yet with the same outspokenness with which he fought for the principles of progress, free research and reform, he opposed the reckless schismatic attempts of the Frankfurt Reform Verein, which aimed at the abrogation of the Mosaic Law, the Talmudic system and the Messianic hope, declaring for an unrestricted development of Mosaism in place of historical Judaism. "No Israelite, who knows his religion," he writes, "will deny it the power of perfectibility. In all its stages, Judaism shows its capacity for continuous development. But yours is not reform and regeneration, which is a matter of slow and gradual growth, but wanton uprooting and overthrow of Judaism, a new religion built on mere negation, anarchy in place of law. The national form served as an armor of protection and as the priestly garb of Israel among the nations, and cannot with impunity be cast off until Israel has fulfilled its priestly mission at the advent of the Messianic time." In this spirit Einhorn participated in the Rabbinical Conferences at Frankfurt am Main and Breslau, taking his stand against Zacharias Frankel, who insisted on the maintenance of the Hebrew in the Synagogal liturgy. "Such sentimentalism," says he, "kills the spiritual life. By striking the rock of a dead language, we cannot bring forth living water, to quench the thirst of the people." Regarding the Messianic prayers in the liturgy, he demanded the elimination of all references to the sacrificial cult and the restoration of the Jewish

State and, instead, the accentuation of Israel's spiritual rebirth and its world-uniting faith. For woman in the synagogue he demands perfect religious equality with man, both as to her duties, rights and privileges. That will reclaim her spiritual powers for the religious community which have been kept back too long. As to the Dietary Laws, they formed part of the Levitical system in the theocratic Jewish State, and should be abrogated as interfering with our mission as a priest-people, to bring our sacred truth home to the people around us.

One of the most interesting dramatic incidents in his life was his controversy with Holdheim who, in misstating the meaning of the Kol Nidre formula, as if it implied the annulment of all future oaths for the year, assailed the whole Talmudic system. Einhorn refuted this attack on Rabbinism by his colleague in the most scathing and unsparing terms, and this very vehemence, showing the intense loyalty of the Jew to his sacred heritage, transformed this antagonist into a life-long close friend. At the same time Einhorn stated his essential difference from Holdheim in regard to the validity of the Mosaic Law, and especially in regard to mixed marriages, always emphasizing the holiness of Israel as the priest-people. "We have passed the stage of negation. We want a constructive Reform." This in the main is his criticism of Holdheim's work *Das Ceremonialgesetz im Messiasreich*.

When Holdheim accepted the call of the Reform Congregation in Berlin, he became his successor in 1847 as Chief Rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, but the more powerful he was as preacher, the more fiercely was he attacked as a heretic by the orthodox elements, both of the Jewish communities and of the non-Jews, headed by the Rostock Professor Franz Delitzsch and the Church. In 1852 the Reform Congregation in Budapest, modeled after Holdheim's Congregation at Berlin with its Sunday service in place of the historical Sabbath, extended a call to him, and he accepted, but only to encounter, at the very outset, the strong opposition of the Government which, owing to the revolutionary agitation of his predecessor Ignatz Ein-

horn, suspected him of similar tendencies and closed his Temple two months after his inauguration. In this terrible disappointment he devoted his involuntary leisure to the working out of a system of Jewish theology *Das Prinzip des Mosaismus* (1854), which remained unfinished, and likewise to the elaboration of his immortal life work, the prayerbook *Olat Tamid*.

When finally a call from the Har Sinai Congregation of Baltimore opened for him a field of activity in the land of freedom, unencumbered by governmental and other ruling powers, he accepted it, in the hope of being able to rear the structure of Reform Judaism in conformity with his ideal. Thus he came to America as a renowned scholar, as an accomplished theologian, and above all as the prophet of a rejuvenated Judaism, voicing both the language and the spirit of Germany, the fatherland of Reform. Herein lay his unique strength, but also his limitation. He was often not understood by the masses and, moreover, dreaded as a radical by both the conservative, and the liberal. His arrival gave rise to a coalition of both elements which, in antagonism to the newcomer, at the Cleveland Conference of 1855, declared the Talmud to be the authoritative interpreter of the Bible and, therefore, binding upon the Jew. Hence ensued the long protracted strife between Dr. Wise and Einhorn, between the West and the East, owing to the deplorable misunderstanding of each other's purposes and points of view. Einhorn, the theologian, laid all stress upon clear systematic Reform, for which he stood forth immovable as the Rock of Gibraltar. Isaac M. Wise, with his wondrous powers of organization, was from the very outset bent upon the Americanization of Jew and Judaism, and would not rest until he had established his cherished Union of American Israel.

Einhorn labored under the great disadvantage of speaking and writing only in German, and so could appeal directly only to the German-speaking laity. Consequently his master-work, the Prayerbook which he published in 1858, and which among all Reform rituals composed for European or American Jewry was the only adequate and really soul-uplifting expression of the innermost thoughts, aspirations

and yearnings of the modern Jew, the genuine production of a religious genius, hailed by the progressive German-Jewish Congregations, remained a book with seven seals for the English world of Jewry. A year before, Isaac M. Wise published his Hebrew Prayerbook, fashioned after the various German Reform rituals with the elimination of all references to the sacrificial cult and the Messiah, with a view of having it made the common Prayerbook of American Israel and therefore under the title of *Minhag America*. The Prayerbook question became henceforth the apple of discord between the two camps, and the conflict raged with bitter animosity, until in 1894 the second volume of the Union Prayerbook for the great Holy Days, based upon Einhorn's ritual, was adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis under the Presidency of Dr. Wise who, in the interest of the union and consolidation of American Reform Judaism, himself withdrew his long-cherished *Minhag America* in favor of the new Prayerbook.

To go back to the Cleveland Conference, its platform encountered a strong protest from Temple Emanu-El of New York as well as from the Baltimore Reform Congregation, and subsequently the periodical 'Sinai' made its appearance, in which Dr. Einhorn up to 1862 discussed the main principles of Reform Judaism, showing that it is not the letter of the Law to which Orthodoxy or Traditionalism blindly adhered, but the spirit which manifests its vitality in continual changes of forms and views, necessitated by the change of conditions of time and environment, that constitutes the essence and permanency of the divine truth. The great test of these principles came eventually with the civil war, when many a Jewish pulpit and periodical together with a large section of those of the Church defended the institution of slavery as sanctioned by the Mosaic Code, to which the Rabbis added the Talmudic Codes. Then it was that Einhorn stepped forth and most vigorously and zealously condemned it as violation of the Mosaic principle of human freedom and a desecration of the dignity of man, made in the image of God. Heedless of the warnings he received of the risk of his life in his

pro-slavery state, he hurled forth his thunderbolts from his pulpit and his 'Sinai' and, as formerly in Europe, he became well-nigh a martyr to the cause. In the middle of the night of April 19th, 1861, he had to flee with his family from the threatening assaults of a raving mob. With the indomitable courage of a hero, he surrendered his pulpit and went to Philadelphia, the stronghold of Jewish Orthodoxy, and preached on the following Fourth of July at the Keneseth Israel Temple a sermon resonant with the confident hope of the triumph of the cause of the Union, to be at once elected Rabbi of the Congregation. His beautiful eulogy on Lincoln in 1865 was vocal with his ardent American patriotism.

In 1866 he took charge of the Congregation Adath Yeshurun of New York, which in 1874 amalgamated with an older Congregation, assuming the name of Beth El. In the metropolis he became the leading power of Eastern Jewry, especially when having the Jewish Times, a half-English, half-German weekly, at his disposal. While his endeavors to establish, in common with Samuel Adler, of Temple Emanu-El, a Rabbinical school failed, he succeeded, together with Adler, in 1869 in convening a Conference of Reform Rabbis at Philadelphia under the presidency of Samuel Hirsch, which was also attended by Drs. Wise and Lilienthal. There, for the first time, the representatives of Reform Judaism of East and West united in formulating the principles of Reform, in outlining its liturgy and defining its attitude to woman in the synagogue. Thus, whilst something of the old conflict between East and West was resuscitated in the following years, the basis was given for the Rabbinical Conferences held at Pittsburgh in 1885, and subsequently elsewhere.

In the meantime the marvelous perseverance and energy of Dr. Wise brought about the realization of his great long-cherished ambition and prophetic vision, the creation of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, with the Hebrew Union College as its center. Einhorn, recognizing this most important meritorious work, discarded the old feud, and willingly lent his hand to the elaboration of a

course of studies for the College in 1876, and it was chiefly due to his encouragement that Dr. Mielziner, in 1879, accepted the offer of a chair of Talmud, to become the Palatine of the Cincinnati College. Dr. Einhorn's closing words of his farewell sermon in July, 1879, shortly before his death, were a blessing for the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS FOR JACOB H. SCHIFF

I GREATLY appreciate the honor conferred on me by the Executive Committee of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in appointing me to voice the sentiments of fervent gratitude and unbounded admiration which permeate American Jewry when recalling the glorious life-work of the unique personality of Jacob H. Schiff, in whose honor this Memorial Service is held today. I fully realize my inability to do justice to him who stood forth as one of the greatest not merely in American Israel, but in our whole generation, great alike as man, as philanthropist, as American and as Jew. My task is all the more difficult when I am mindful of the glowing tributes that have been offered to this prince of men throughout the country, from the White House to the humblest of hovels, by the most eloquent lips and the most graphic pens of statesmen, of pulpit orators and captains of finance, Jews and Gentiles. And yet I feel encouraged by the genuine love and friendship I cherished for this God-beloved man, which was so warmly reciprocated by him to the last, and likewise by my personal knowledge of his career in past years, to present a portraiture of his life with some insight into the inner shrine of his great soul. When reading those remarkable outbursts of admiration and love that came forth from all stations of life and all parts of the world, I saw the scriptural verse verified: "Those beloved by God are at their departure like the bright orb of day at its setting, gilding the horizon with its majestic splendor to last long after it has disappeared from sight." Indeed, as the Rabbis say, greater are the righteous when their mortal frame no longer binds them to earth than when they are with us in life. The funeral procession alone, in which the highest and the humblest of New York marched by the thousands as mourners, sufficiently testified to his greatness. So let me portray to you the life of Jacob H. Schiff as a type of man worthy of emulation.

On his way to America, a youth of eighteen years of age, he must have felt like Jacob at Beth El, recalling precious memories of his childhood and dreaming dreams of the future brightened up by faith in the God of his fathers. The city of Frankfurt-on-the-Main where he was born on the 10th of January, 1847, had not only equipped him with a fair share of general culture, but had also dowered him with proud traditions of a glorious past. To be a native of Frankfurt was considered such a patent of nobility that the saying was: "Never would the most famous men in history be spoken of, but the people would in a jocular vein remark: "What a pity that they were not born in Frankfurt!" Jacob Schiff's own pedigree reached back to the fourteenth century. His ancestry comprised scholars of wide renown, among whom was Meyer, or as he was called, Maharam Schiff, one of the most brilliant Talmudists of his time. It was no small matter for Jacob H. Schiff, either, to be trained in the Religious School of Samson Raphael Hirsch, the great leader of Neo-Orthodoxy, the lofty-minded idealist among the conservative Rabbis, whose mighty spiritual influence as teacher still abides also with me to this day. On the other hand, Frankfurt was the centre of the world's finance under the Rothschilds and their competitors, teeming with ambitious enterprise, where his own father, Moses Schiff, was himself a broker connected with the Rothschilds. We thus see him select his life's vocation amidst many a silent vow like Jacob of old, praying for God's blessing and guidance. And God did guide him and bless him with wondrous success, which we can only regard as providential.

Men of enormous wealth are frequently looked upon as born under a lucky star. Read, however, the life story of such money magnates as Carnegie and Rockefeller, and you see them rise from the lowest round of the ladder to the top by dint of pronounced personal qualities, painstaking endeavor and circumspection, patient thrift and keen foresight. As yon Talmudic sage answered a Bible reader who, taking exception to the verse: "God giveth wisdom to the wise," asked "Why not rather to the fools who need it most?" "The fools," said he, "scarcely know

how to apply the power of wisdom, only the wise know how to use it advantageously." Jacob H. Schiff on coming to America at once learned to prize this land of great opportunity, and with his remarkable intellect, his superior judgment and marvelous gift of vision soon rose to be a power to be reckoned with. When affiliated with the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb and Co. in 1875, he became, through his connections with many European houses, a dominant factor in the money market, and New York's financiers as well as large railroad corporations found in him a valued adviser and a tower of strength, as he enjoyed their confidence owing to his integrity and readiness to serve. Nor did he wait with bestowing his generous aid upon the less fortunate until he had amassed millions as did his great compeers, and then select like these some specially great branch of philanthropy for the benefit of humanity. He rather followed the exquisite maxim of the Rabbis: "Make God and humanity your partners by giving the tenth of your income to the needy and you will become rich in benefiting others." As his means and his sphere of interests enlarged, his sympathies and philanthropic efforts grew ever larger, too. In joining hands with Hill, the Railroad builder of the West, and afterwards with Harriman, he obtained a mastery over the whole railroad system of the country by which he was enabled to extend the facilities of travel and transportation over the entire continent, and thereby to promote industry and commerce in all directions. But his master stroke of financiering and at the same time of fine statesmanship was his large loan to Japan when she was engaged in war with Russia, which made his firm a great world power. And in all these colossal undertakings the foremost thought that moved him was the ambition and desire to render America the land of promise and of prosperity for many, as it had become to him. Thus his life was never one of ease and leisure or of selfish pleasure, but one of duty and of service.

As a man he was with all his innate aristocratic dignity a true democrat. Far from conceit or purse-pride, he was simple and unpretentious, gentle-hearted, kindly and affable to all who approached him, a true friend of man. Punctu-

ality is said to be the virtue of kings. It was his, and this enabled him to accomplish so much and to be so much to many.

As his own life was one of immaculate purity and integrity, so as loving husband and wise father in common with his charming and thoughtful wife, he knew how to impart the spirit and character of refinement, of dignity and nobility of soul to his home and his children, shunning all extravagances of self-indulgent and dazzling luxury, and cultivating instead the virtues and graces of old-fashioned Jewish domesticity with its mutual affection and filial regard, its contentment and peace, its hospitality and friendship, the valuations only of what is genuinely beautiful and good as the fragrant flowers in a garden of joy and bliss.

As a philanthropist he occupied a place in history such as few men ever did. Like Abraham, he considered himself as the custodian of his wealth, the steward of the large fortune with which God had blessed him. As was remarked by a former President of the New York Chamber of Commerce in his eulogy: "The Fatherhood of God meant to him, in his daily life, the brotherhood of man." He did not concentrate his benefactions upon certain spheres of activity, whether charitable or educational, social or scientific, nor did he confine them to any creed or race; he made them world-wide. Always mindful of the Psalmist's words: "Blessed is the man who wisely looks to the requirements of the poor," he devised ever new measures for suffering humanity. Nor was he satisfied with the mere giving; he made the care for the helpless and homeless a matter of personal devotion and solicitude. He attended to the hundreds of petitions and requests that came to him from week to week or from day to day all himself in his correspondence, so that no one ever learned the amount of good he did in private. Nor did he disdain the discomfort and trouble of visiting the distressed in their humble downtown homes in emergencies of sickness and death.

The great public institutions of charity and education, Jewish or non-Jewish, local or national, civic or broadly humanitarian, had in him not merely a life-long liberal supporter, but a zealous leader, indefatigable in the per-

formance of duty and ever watchful in the promotion of their progress, while at the same time he avoided all recognition and honor. At the Montefiore Home for Incurables, which he founded and served as President for thirty years, he was almost a daily visitor, making the rounds among the patients to offer them words of cheer and ready advice, to be literally, "an eye to the blind and an arm to the helpless." Once while there, word was sent to him from his downtown office that his presence was wanted in some important business, and his answer was: "Business can wait, but these painstricken inmates here demand my immediate attention." He was the first to encourage Miss Lillian Wald in her visiting nurse service, and he built her the home for her Neighborhood work, thus endorsing her beautiful saying: "Not they whom we try to uplift, but we who are privileged to help them, are the true beneficiaries." Not only every charitable organization of any merit in the city, but many throughout the country received substantial contributions from him. And there was one striking feature in the mode of his benefactions. Whenever any new public need was felt and urged, he not only took the initiative by large subscriptions, but he also imposed the duty and responsibility upon others to do their share by making it conditional that the full amount required for the purpose he made up by the people at large, thus following the Rabbinical dictum: "Greater is he who makes others work for the common good than he who does it all alone." He stimulated and educated his whole generation to take a more active interest in the various branches of philanthropy.

But especially close to his heart was the education of youth, of men and women, native or immigrant, Jew or non-Jew, in order to render them useful and self-respecting Americans. With his far-sighted wisdom he placed himself in the front rank of those eager to promote knowledge among all classes and ages, and with lavish hands he encouraged every educational object, to stand forth as the Maecenas of learning, of literature, science and art. With a many-sidedness which is amazing, he took prominent interest in the creation and maintenance of the Museum

of Natural History as well as in the Metropolitan museum of Art. He was one of the founders of Barnard College, and the Chair of Social Economics with its scholarships at Columbia University owes its existence to him. So also the Semitic Museum at Harvard, the Semitic Department of Cornell and of the Congressional Library at Washington, and the Jewish Department of the New York Library. Palestine Research work had in him for years a regular supporter. He also took a leading part in municipal reform.

But while his princely munificence aided in a thousand ways the cause of humanity, materially and spiritually; while his American patriotism was his leit-motif in all his endeavors, growing in depth and intensity as the years rolled on, so as to prove him to be a standard bearer of Americanism who stood the test in the critical time of the war, when so many wavered in the severe trial; his heart of hearts, the very essence of his being was that of a devout, sturdy and faithful Jew. His strong Jewish convictions manifested themselves wherever he went and in whatever circles he moved. His love for and his pride in his ancestral heritage hallowed every step of his life. As his house bore the ancient symbol of the Mezuzzah on its doorpost, so he was strict in his Sabbath observance, never allowing his immense business concern to infringe upon any of the Jewish holy days. Though familiar with the treasures of our Hebrew literature, he loved to worship the God of his fathers in the modern tongue, the German at first and then the English, joining as he did, when but a young man, the Reform Congregation Temple Emanu-El to become a regular participant in its divine service. For many years I had him every Sabbath morning as an appreciative occupant of a pew in front at Beth El, and afterwards, Dr. Schulman, my successor, and there was no more interested and congenial listener in the congregation than he, a real inspiration to the preacher in his modesty.

But before dwelling on his religious views, I must speak of him as the world champion of Jewry and Judaism. Israel, says the Midrash, is likened to the lamb, because, just as all parts of its tender body tremble when only one

is touched, so are all the members of Israel's body affected when only one is stricken. Thus was the great heart of Jacob Schiff responsive to every demand concerning Jewry throughout the world, resonant at every vibration as David's Aeolian harp was said to have been at every movement of the morning breeze. When and wheresoever the Jewish cause needed a defender and spokesman, he stepped forth boldly and courageously to claim a hearing from the men in power, nor was he ever backward in venting his indignation as an American when seeing the rights and honor of his coreligionists assailed or menaced in far off lands, without our Government's intercession on behalf of humanity and liberty. Like Jacob the patriarch, 'he strove with gods and men until he prevailed.'

Ever since the persecution and pogroms of barbaric Russia and her Czar forced the unfortunate victims by the thousands and tens of thousands to seek refuge and safety on our hospitable shores, he stood out as the foremost protector and helper of the immigrants, and no sacrifice of time, labor and money was too great for him to bring. He traveled far and wide to secure them a shelter, and either as a trustee of the Baron de Hirsch Fund or as the head of other organizations to open for them the road to useful labor as American citizens, as tillers of the soil or pursuers of a trade. And when the tide of immigration threatened to bring great evil upon them through the increasing congestion in the metropolis, he endeavored to divert the stream to the West by having the port of Galveston opened for them. Nor did he for a moment fail to do his utmost in offering and systematizing the relief of the millions whose lives were in constant peril of starvation and massacre abroad, especially during the cruelties and devastations of the war. He actually made their great suffering and woe his own; he bore their burden with the anguish of soul of the humblest of them, and one of the last public documents of his was the pathetic appeal of the American world to save the imperilled millions.

He was too much of a God-fearing and believing Jew to falter in his faith in the high destiny of the Jew, the martyr-priest of the nations, in Israel's world mission as

announced by our great prophets and re-emphasized by our Reform pioneers, Einhorn and Wise. He felt, above all, certain that America with its principles of freedom and justice taken as foundation stones from the rock of Sinai, America, the land of common sense and common education with its fair recognition of all creeds and its unhampered exchange of views of pulpit and platform, ever eager to have its starry banner stand for humanity's highest ideals, will ultimately find in the simple teachings of Judaism the all-uniting religious force, in its belief in the only one God, the universal Father. The preservation of Judaism and the dissemination of its lofty truths among young and old was, therefore, to him a matter of deepest and all-absorbing concern. As in his younger days he was one of the founders of the various organizations for the promotion of Jewish education and learning in the down-town districts, so he bestowed in his maturer years his generous gifts and his personal care upon the erection and maintenance of the higher institutions of Jewish learning and the subvention of great literary undertakings for the propagation of Jewish knowledge. To mention some of the latter, there was the Jewish Publication Society, the Jewish Encyclopedia, the new Bible translation for which he furnished the means, and, above all, the creation of a fund for the editing and translation of the Jewish Classics to familiarize an enlightened world, Jewish or non-Jewish, with the gems of Post-Biblical literature—which alone will make him live in history as the great reawakener of Jewish lore.

But, above all, he looked to the pulpit as the power destined to revive the dormant spirit of Judaism in this materialistic age of ours, and to reinvigorate in a generation bewildered by modern theories and concepts the faith in God and His holy guidance of man. From the Rabbi as the God-chosen expounder of Israel's law of truth and righteousness, the messenger of the Lord of hosts, he expected the regeneration and reconsecration of God's priest-people to be 'a light to the nations and a covenant to the peoples,' to interlink all classes, creeds and systems of thought. Therefore, he built his fondest hopes upon the centers of the Torah study, the Theological Seminary

in New York, whose conservative character in harmony with its large conservative surroundings gave him the promise, especially under the direction of Dr. Schechter, whom he loved and admired, of turning out successful and competent leaders of Jewish Orthodoxy, and the Hebrew Union College, the creation of the master mind of Isaac M. Wise, destined to build up American Judaism in full accord with the modern principles of historical research and render it the life force of Jewry throughout the West, the South and the East. While he heaped his large-hearted donations upon the former to elevate its standing as a metropolitan institution, he identified himself more and more also with the latter, the Hebrew Union College, for the erection of whose new edifice he gave me the first twenty-five thousand dollars. He followed with growing interest the great achievements of its gifted alumni, who made Israel's faith, as never before, a power and influence felt throughout the land. He endowed a Teachers' Institute in connection with both Rabbinical Schools with \$50,000 each and greatly helped in the reorganization of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, while eager to enlarge its scope to have the Synagogue and School work extended over the entire land so as to bring the Jewish people everywhere within the reach of their religious influence. His high esteem for the religious leader and teacher was especially manifested by him when on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, he created a pension fund for superannuated Rabbis and Teachers. And with all this he kept in touch with the most Orthodox Jewish institutions, showing his sympathy with all their endeavors. And when he saw a rift in the clouds that hung over the Jews in the eastern lands in the new outlook offered by the British victory in Palestine, he hailed the prospect of getting a firm hold upon the holy land and of rendering it under more favorable conditions "a homeland," as he said, "of Jewish culture."

He celebrated his seventieth birthday by the donation of \$700,000 for various charities. The crowning feat of his blessed life was his will with its benefactions amounting to nearly a million and a half dollars, of which one hundred thousand were bequeathed to our College and likewise to

the New York Seminary, and here again he displayed his wisdom in making the provision that of all his bequests only the yearly income should be used, whereas the capital should remain intact for all the future. Thus he held up his hands, true to his heart, until the sun of his life set. And we, the faculty and Board of Governors of the Hebrew Union College, had the satisfaction of having given him real pleasure by conferring on him the honorary degree of D. H. L., which he greatly appreciated, shortly before his last illness. He died in his 74th year on September 25th, 1920, at the close of the Sabbath following the solemn Day of Atonement.

In looking over this wonderful life, which was, in very fact, a sanctification of God and a glorification of man, we may exclaim: "Where shall we find a man such as this, a man in whom the spirit of God dwells?" Of Abraham, the legend tells that he wore a jewel on his breast the radiance of which was such that whosoever looked at it forgot his ills, and when dying, he hung it up on the sky, saying, "Look up there and you will be cured of all adversities." The precious jewel of Jacob Schiff's life has been transferred to the celestial realm from where it will ever shine forth as a source of inspiration and a star of guidance to cure many of evils, the best refutation of the charges of our maligners and traducers and an eloquent protest against all socialistic or communistic theories, a model and pattern to all who may learn the potentialities of the Jew, putting to shame those who shun the name and shirk the obligations implied therein. Oh, that his spirit may ever dwell among us to make us live as he lived, and that our College, the Union and all our institutions with their sacred work may ever come up to the high expectations he cherished for them, and may his memory bring untold blessings to his devoted life consort, his children and grandchildren.

"For thus shall be blessed the man who feareth the Lord."

Amen!

DR. ALEXANDER KOHUT

WE HAVE assembled here to discharge a solemn duty. A custom born of reverence for merit and greatness bids us to-day to recall the virtues and striking qualities which marked the career of the distinguished master and leader in Israel, who departed this life a few weeks ago, and, with tender regard, lay a chaplet fragrant with sweet memories upon his fresh grave. Voicing, then, the sentiments of the Jewish ministry of this city, I say with unfeigned sorrow: נטלה עטרת ראשנו. An ornament of American Israel, a crown of learning, a diadem of Jewish erudition, has fallen from our head.

Dr. Alexander Kohut occupied a unique place in the Jewish world as scholar and as rabbi. A beautiful saying of the rabbis is: נדולים צדיקים במיתתם יותר מבחייהם—'The righteous attain a higher stature in death than when alive.' Indeed, we cannot help measuring our co-workers by our own wishes and aims, in order to find some deficiency which flatters our pride. Yet as soon as the noble champion has completed his course, we view his life in the light of his own mighty impulse and divine calling, and, behold! it shines forth triumphantly, compelling our unstinted admiration. And so let me reverently apply the Scriptural verse: והמשכילים יזהירו כזהר הרקיע ומצדיקי רבים ככוכבים לעולמי עד—'The wise shine like the brightness of the firmament, and those that lead many to righteousness, like the stars, forever and aye.' Oh, how solemn and sublime appears life when fashioned after a great pattern beheld on the mount of vision! How luminous is its track seen in the brightness of a guiding principle! As each star of the heavenly hosts reflects a splendor and beauty of its own, so does human life in the garb of some eternal truth!

Dr. Kohut was a star of great magnitude in the firmament of Jewish learning, and death could only lend him transcendent glory. In Talmudical lore, he towered above all his colleagues. He had but few equals among the rabbis,

and in America his vast erudition was more admired than turned to living use. Naturally enough, of what avail is all rabbinical lore and Talmudical philology, to our practical American nineteenth century Judaism? Thus many would speak.

Friends, of what advantage is the brilliance of the stars in the sky or the charming beauty of the flowers in the field, since you cannot grind them in your mill for your own use? We live in an age which prizes everything from a utilitarian standpoint. Unless they feed the hungry stomach or supply some physical want, learning, science, art and religion are of little weight in the scales of our materialistic generation. People fail to see that the scholar or artist who devotes his life to the pursuit of a lofty truth benefits the masses in a far higher sense than does he who offers relief to the momentarily distressed, for he feeds the mainsprings of humanity, he weaves the golden threads of ideal life which is the tissue of the ages, the warp and woof of history. He is *עסוק במלאכתו של הקב"ה*, engaged in the work of the world's sublime Ruler.

In this spiritual atmosphere the Jewish Rabbi of old was nurtured; for he was not merely the expounder of the Law, but his very life was a continued act of devotion and self-sacrifice for the Torah, Israel's treasury of life and of comfort during all times of trouble and trial. To live, and, if needs be, to die for the Law—this was the beau-ideal of the rabbi.

Now, whatever fine distinctions we to-day or here in this country may draw between the Jewish religion, or Law, and the Talmud, in the sphere where young Kohut grew up, Torah and Talmud were inseparably one. Both together were taken to be the life-element of the Jew. To be a great rabbi meant to be a great Talmudist. And Dr. Kohut's career was, indeed, a great martyrdom in the service of this ideal. His biography reads like a romance.

As in the Book of Proverbs, Wisdom says: "I love those that love me," so would the Talmud whisper its many secrets only to its beloved devotee, to its enthusiastic lover. Of Joseph Caro, the author of the *Shulhan Aruk* and *Maggid Mishnah*, the tale runs that his work gradually

assumed for him the shape of an angel, who would disclose to him every mystery of heaven. Our deceased friend beheld his own guardian spirit, the very angel of his life, in the Aruk of Rabbi Nathan. His mission to write his monumental work on Talmudical lexicography came over him like a revelation. Like another Alexander, eager to conquer unknown territories, he started upon the wide ocean of the Talmud, with the purpose of lighting up its darkness and rearing a light-house, by the bright lamps of which navigation through the shoals and cliffs of the Talmud would be easy for any student. And, behold! no sacrifice, no privation, no struggle nor disappointment could shake his firm resolve to undertake a task from which hundreds before him had shrunk. If he was not equipped with better means, he was spurred on by a holy vow, by wondrous steadfastness of purpose, which made him, as Dr. Frankel said of him when he left the Breslau Seminary as an ordained rabbi, quite young 'a worker, with double speed,' studying, as he did, day and night until the goal was reached. Well may we, therefore, say of him, as was said in the dirge sung over Rabbi Abina, the compiler of the Babylonian Talmud: חמרים הניעו ראש על צדיק כחמר נשים ימים כלילות על שם לילות כימים. 'Bend your heads, ye palm trees, for a palm tree among men has fallen. Turn the day into night while mourning for him who, in search for the light of truth, turned the nights into days!'

Nor did this insatiable thirst for learning and energy ever leave him. Even after his great work had been finished, he would not allow himself to rest on his laurels. Though greatly suffering from the ailment his incessant studies had brought on him, and in the very throes of the fatal disease, he published his last work, *Lamp of Wisdom and Light of Shade*, dedicated to his physician, who cheered up his night of despondency—a lasting testimony to the brilliant light that shone in the extraordinary man.

But his fame as eloquent expounder of Judaism's lofty doctrines in the pulpit was also won by him at an early age. His fiery eloquence as Hungarian preacher and patriot won for him a prominent rank among the Jewish leaders of Austria, and when Ahawath Chesed looked for a befitting

successor to eloquent, beloved Dr. Huebsch, he was the best choice. Of course, new obligations and unwonted tasks were involved in this call to America. Yet why should Dr. Kohut, with his vast resources and wondrous energies, shrink from shouldering them? America's reputed generous-heartedness seemed to offer greater prospects for the success of his grand literary undertaking than did all the Jewish princes of wealth in Europe, to whom he had appealed in vain for adequate support.

Dr. Kohut's arrival in this country lent American Judaism not only new lustre, but also a new impetus and incentive to rabbinical study and research. And, on the other hand, his own views expanded under the benign influence of American liberty, and the rich faculties of his versatile mind developed in new directions. Thanks to the noble self-denial of that young wife who inspired him and his household with genuine love and zeal for America's language, views and principles, he speedily became a glowing admirer and a soul-stirring standard-bearer of American liberty and progress, and a prominent leader of American Judaism—a theologian who commanded the respect of Gentiles as well as Jews.

About his personal traits, his modesty and his kind and gentle ways as man, as colleague and as teacher, I will rather leave others speak. Suffice it to say that he was always as free from conceit as from fanatical presumptions, and appreciative of every word or service of others.

Among the giants of Biblical antiquity, Chanoch is recorded as the one who, though he had not reached half of the years the rest did, outlasted them all, for, 'he walked before God, and God took him unto Himself.' As the 'great scribe,' he continued to live in the memory of men. Rabbi Jehuda Chanoch Kohut was also summoned away in the zenith of his life; but as one of the great Soferim, the learned scribes, his name will be forever engraved upon the annals of Jewish history.

May his great learning and literary activity, his wondrous perseverance, and his ardent love and zeal for Judaism and its institutions, work as an inspiring example and a lasting lesson upon the younger generation! May the seeds

of truth which he has sown and the work of righteousness which he promoted be a blessing forever to Israel, to America, to all lands and times, and his memory be blessed for evermore! Amen.

EMIL G. HIRSCH

WHEN the soul of the great law-giver Moses had left its earthly tabernacle and he lay sheltered under the wings of the divine majesty, we are told in the Talmud, the celestial choir sang his praise, saying: He hath executed the righteousness of the Lord and His ordinances unto Israel. And God in His holiness spoke: Who will now rise up for Me against the evil-doers? Who will stand up for Me against the workers of iniquity? and throughout the length and breadth of Israel's camp a heavenly voice was heard echoing forth the words: Moses the great teacher in Israel is dead!

In Emil Gustave Hirsch, American Jewry has lost a personality beyond compare in power and influence, a master of the word and pen without equal in pulpit and platform, who knew no fear in exposing the faults and errors of his generation, and a champion of justice and freedom, battling for human dignity and equality, for integrity and manhood, whose place in the community will not soon be filled. Recognized alike by Jew and Gentile as a leader of thought in this advanced age of ours, and likewise as a man of principle unyielding in his concept of truth and of right, and voicing with amazing force his lofty ideals of life, he towered as a giant above the rest of men. It is, indeed, a difficult task to pass an unbiased opinion of his lifework at this early date. We can only acknowledge with gratitude to God that He 'anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows,' pouring so much grace upon his lips and girding his loins with vigor and courage to prompt him to lead many to righteousness and imbue them with love for our ancient heritage, and by the brilliancy of his mind and the largeness of his vision to impress the outside world with the grandeur and sublimity of Israel's truth.

From the very cradle he was singled out for great achievement. He was spared the hardships and privations, the anxieties and troubles that fell to the lot of most of the men who made the teaching and preaching of the Torah

the object of their life; nor had he to undergo the outer and inner struggles that embittered the life of the Reform pioneers, and frequently made them martyrs of their conviction. When young Emil G. Hirsch entered the field, the exasperating battle for modern thought had been turned into triumphant victory, and the road to greater conquest had been fairly smoothed out for him, to permit him to look forth with perfect confidence and hope upon the future.

To begin with his childhood, there was his mother, Louise Nickolls Hirsch, a woman of great refinement and culture, of charm and tenderness of heart, who nurtured the growing lad with the milk of human kindness, and instilled into his soul those noble traits and lovely qualities which made him in later life the favorite as well as the helpful friend of society. His father, Dr. Samuel Hirsch, Rabbi of the Duchy of Luxembourg, and one of the leading Reform pioneers, already famous as the author of *The Religious Philosophy of the Jews*, which appeared in 1842, was a profound thinker and a strict disciplinarian, guided mainly by the dictates of reason. He opened for the wide-awake boy the path of knowledge, stimulating him with an unquenchable desire for truth. He taught him not merely the rudiments of Hebrew literature, introducing him into the treasures of the Torah and the Talmud, but also familiarized him with the philosophical system of Hegel, the sharp dialectician who construed the whole history of life as a continuous process of thought culminating in God as the Absolute. Only in contrast to the Hegelian system which centered in the Christian Trinity, he pointed to humanity as the centre which starts in Hebrew Scripture with the toil of civilization to end in Israel's Messianic goal. Thus the Torah, which is not fixed *Law*, but fluid and flexible *Doctrine*, presented to him the most sublime form in which the God of history is served by man. Samuel Hirsch has rightly been called the Philo of modern times. As the Alexandrian thinker endeavored to harmonize Mosaism with the Platonic and Stoic philosophy by way of allegorizing the Scripture, so did Samuel Hirsch in his *Religionsphilosophie*, and later on in his Catechism, assign to the Pentateuch legends the

character of allegories, and to the Mosaic rites, such as circumcision, that of symbols expressive of religious truth. On the one hand, we find him among the foremost radicals at the Rabbinical Conferences of 1842-5, whether in regard to the transfer of the historic Sabbath to the civic day of rest, or to intermarriage of Jew and Gentile, and, on the other hand, he sided with the Conservative Rabbis for whom the Abrahamitic covenant constitutes the indispensable condition of adherence to Judaism. Aside, then, from the allegoristic and symbolistic interpretation of the Torah, which could not be maintained in view of the critical-historical research of modern times, Emil Hirsch adhered in the main to his father's rationalistic system to the very last.

A third factor which aided in the moulding of the young life of Emil G. Hirsch was the city of Luxembourg in which he was born on May 22, 1852. Situated on the border of Germany, Holland, and French-speaking Belgium, his native city trained his tongue and ear to the use of three languages, which gave him in his early youth the advantage of mastering with ease many other languages, and so developed in him a phenomenal linguistic talent which later on unlocked for him without any effort the literary treasures of many nations, ancient and modern.

When in 1866 his father accepted the call to Philadelphia as successor to David Einhorn, America opened a new world for Emil Hirsch, to enlarge his mental horizon in every direction, and, while he completed his secular education at first at the Episcopal Academy and then at the University of Pennsylvania, whence he graduated in 1872, he imbibed Jewish learning in the atmosphere of Philadelphia Jewry. The Rabbinical Conference in 1869, which held its sessions in his parental home under his father's presidency, could not fail to impress him and arouse his interest in progressive American Judaism. When twenty years of age, young Hirsch went to Berlin to study at the Hochschule, and to sit, together with Felix Adler, Emanuel Schreiber, and afterwards with Samuel Sale, at the feet of Abraham Geiger, the pioneer of systematic Reform Judaism, the eminent Jewish historian who, with his remarkable

divinatory powers, disclosed for his hearers and readers the deep historic forces of Judaism in its various epochs, so as to show it to have undergone a continuous process of growth and development, in accordance with the cultural conditions and requirements of the time and environment. Here the fundamental principles of religious progress and reform on the basis of historical-critical research into both the Biblical and Rabbinical literature were elucidated for him, and this point of view was rather confirmed for him by Israel Levy, the conservative Talmudist, in his fine analyses of the Tannaic periods. At the University it was chiefly Hermann Steinthal, the originator of Ethnic Psychology, in common with his brother-in-law, Moritz Lazarus, who directed his mind towards a deeper study of Ethics as the essence of religion. The Hochschule at Berlin stands for what, since the days of Zunz and Gans, is termed the 'Science of Judaism'—*Die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*—and, evading the terms of theology or religion in its specific form, does not turn out ordained Rabbis. Accordingly, Emil G. Hirsch came back to America in 1876 with the title of Doctor of Philosophy, like most of the older generation of modern Rabbis. In 1877, he was elected as Rabbi by the Har Sinai Congregation of Baltimore, Maryland, and, after being there a year, he accepted a call from the Adath Israel Congregation of Louisville, Kentucky, remaining there from 1878 to 1880. During these first years of his ministry, he had ample opportunity to show his metal. In 1878 he married Mathilda Einhorn, a daughter of Dr. David Einhorn, who became a most devoted and self-sacrificing helpmate to him during his whole distinguished career.

If any Rabbi ever found his destiny linked with that of a community which was to grow and expand in power and prominence with him, and in which the young eagle could unfold the wings of his genius, to achieve the great task Providence had assigned to him, it was Emil G. Hirsch when he took charge of the Sinai Congregation of Chicago, to remain its minister until his death in 1923. Among all the Jewish congregations of America, Sinai Congregation stood out from the very outset as one striving for progress

and independence and for liberalism in thought and in practice. Consisting almost exclusively of German-speaking members, a goodly number of whom were men of advanced views, it first constituted itself under Bernhard Felsenthal's leadership in 1858, as a Reform Verein and, in 1861, it reorganized itself as the Sinai Congregation, adopting the Einhorn ritual. After Dr. Felsenthal's resignation in 1864, Dr. Chronik, a radical of the Feuerbach school was elected, but his abstruse discourses threatened to split the Congregation. When participating in the Philadelphia Conference in 1869, he proposed the transfer of the Sabbath Service to Sunday, against which even Abraham Geiger, who had recommended him to the Congregation, remonstrated in his *Zeitschrift*, declaring that such a step would be tantamount to a recognition of Christianity's ruling power in matters of religion. When, in 1871, the great conflagration of the city of Chicago destroyed Sinai Temple, it fell to my lot as Rabbi to restore unity and harmony in the Congregation, and I especially succeeded in bringing it about by introducing, in 1874, Sunday Services, in addition to the regular Sabbath Service, both of which, held provisionally in a hall, were well attended. In 1876, a beautiful new Temple was dedicated by me. Therein the sermon was delivered in German and English alternately. In 1879, I accepted the call of Temple Beth El of New York as successor to Dr. Einhorn, and Sinai Temple remained practically vacant for a year, waiting, so to speak, for Emil G. Hirsch to become its powerful leader. Soon the Temple proved all too small for the growing audiences that listened spell-bound to the fiery eloquence and wondrous versatility of the gifted speaker, whose flowing sentences, rich in thought and replete with humor and wit, thrilled, electrified and inspired all, whether Jew or Gentile, who came to hear him. And in 1892 the Temple had to be enlarged and remodelled.

As early as 1885, the Congregation 'relieved Dr. Hirsch of preaching on Sabbath morning,' which was tantamount to abrogating the historical Sabbath in favor of Sunday. Dr. Hirsch, however, would not give up the Sabbath, as far as his own person was concerned, for he preached either Friday evening or Sabbath in 'the little Synagogue around

the corner,' or elsewhere, when opportunity offered, taking his text from the weekly *Parashah*, and skilfully using the Midrashic interpretation for illustration of his sermon. Nor did he then rest on his laurels, won from all sides, but with all the greater zeal until late midnight he would pore over the tomes of Midrash and Talmud, and dive into every new work on science and philosophy of which he could get hold, thus keeping abreast of the progressive ideas of the age and the most recent research in the wide field of knowledge. Aided by a phenomenal memory and extraordinary mental grasp of things, he absorbed and assimilated what he read with wonderful rapidity, thus being able to expound every new current of thought with striking lucidity and felicity of form for his hearers and readers.

One point, however, must not be overlooked in the whole Reform movement of American Judaism up to Emil Hirsch's time. Both in the West and in the East, it was carried on by the German-speaking element. As the sermons, so were the prayer-books and hymnals for the most part German, and the Jewish press, as far as it stood for progress and reform, generally bore the same character. When the Jewish Times of New York had outlived its usefulness as the German organ of reform in the spirit of David Einhorn, the *Zeitgeist* in Milwaukee, edited by Isaac and Adolph Moses and Emil G. Hirsch, appeared in 1880, to serve for three years as its forum, having the outspoken American Reform Rabbis as its contributors.

The turning-point came in 1885 when the Pittsburgh Conference of Reform Rabbis under the presidency of Isaac M. Wise was convened by me with the view of winning the rising generation for our cause. The Pittsburgh Conference had, in fact, a two-fold purpose. The platform adopted was to give a clear, pronounced, and public expression to the leading principles of American Reform Judaism, while, on the other hand, the urgency of having Einhorn's Prayer-book, then in use by many prominent congregations, rendered into the vernacular was discussed by the younger rabbis, and this led finally to the adoption by the Central Conference of American Rabbis at Atlantic City in 1894 of the Union Prayerbook, based mainly on Einhorn's ritual.

The whole movement brought about the consolidation of the progressive forces of American Judaism. With this object in view, *The Jewish Reformer* was then started by me, partly in English and partly German, and Emil G. Hirsch, who had played a conspicuous role at the Pittsburgh Conference, became co-editor and a regular contributor to both the English and the German sections. Many of his articles, among which I would single out his discourses on Isaiah of Babylon, on Ethical Judaism and Ethical Materialism, bear the stamp of genuine mastery. Owing to lack of support, however, the journal soon became defunct and forgotten.

Meanwhile Emil G. Hirsch became a power in the Chicago community and felt called upon to have an organ of his own. In 1892 he started the *Reform Advocate*, for which he wrote the leading articles that have all these years commanded the attention of readers who loved independence of thought. Numerous discourses and essays were published therein, dealing with an endless variety of subjects, theoretical and practical, ancient and modern, popular and scholarly; but always luminous, suggestive, and of telling force. Noteworthy were the articles on New Testament history, as well as on prophetic and rabbinical literature; and above all the stand Hirsch took in the cause of social justice. Most effective was the mighty power the *Reform Advocate* wielded as the sharp, critical, observer and fearless censor of the religious and social conditions and occurrences in Jewish and Christian circles of the city of Chicago, or the country at large. As in his pulpit utterances, so did Hirsch in his weekly editorials, unsparingly expose by his sarcasm, which often pierced friend and foe like a two-edged sword, sham and hypocrisy, ignorance and folly, in high or low places, insisting upon what in his opinion was right and true.

When the Biblical Department of the *Jewish Encyclopedia* in its first two volumes under the editorship of Morris Jastrow allowed Christian scholars to furnish articles which rather militated against the spirit of positive Judaism, Hirsch was appointed Department Editor at my suggestion. In writing most of these articles himself, he gave evidence in a remarkable degree of profound and indefatigable study and of original research. Later on he likewise contributed a

number of articles to Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. He also translated, in masterly diction, Dr. Einhorn's ritual for Temple Sinai and such other congregations as would not part with their cherished Prayerbook Olath Tamid, omitting, however, the entire domestic service.

But Hirsch's sphere of activity expanded in many directions. In 1888 he was appointed a member, and later on, President of the Board of Trustees of the Chicago Public Library, remaining in office until 1897. He was a Republican Presidential Elector-at-large for Illinois in 1896, and was a member of the Board of Commissioners of Public Charities of the State of Illinois from 1897 to 1906. From 1892 on, for a number of years, he occupied the chair of Rabbinical Literature and Philosophy at the University of Chicago. That same year he was appointed the Turnbull Lecturer at Johns Hopkins University, taking Jewish Poetry for his subject. At the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, he gave a series of lectures on the Historical Development of Jewish Theology, in 1901, upon which occasion he received the D.D. degree and was elected a member of its Board of Governors. Fourteen years later he gave another series of lectures there, treating of Judaism's Relation to Unitarianism, Monism, and Ethical Culturism. When I became the President of the College, he manifested his warm interest in the institution by a powerful address on the occasion of my inaugural, and aided me by securing substantial subscriptions for the College from his congregation. He was constantly chosen as orator on public and patriotic occasions in various cities, and also selected as lecturer at large throughout the country, which gave him the opportunity of enlightening the people on the various topics of the day, particularly on those pertaining to education, morality and religion, thereby bringing about a better understanding of Judaism among the masses. Berlin and London audiences also occasionally learned to know and admire him as preacher and orator.

In the Chicago community he devoted much of his time and labor to the promotion of the common welfare, social, intellectual and moral. Hirsch zealously espoused the cause of the Russian Jews, living mostly on the West Side, and he

took a leading part in the founding and maintenance of a Manual Training School and other organizations. In 1912 he saw his great work for Sinai's Temple and its large field of activity throughout the city crowned by the erection of an imposing two-fold structure, the one dedicated to divine worship, the other to the various functions of a social center—a proud ornament to the entire community.

Having thus been privileged as preacher, writer and communal worker to cast a unique lustre upon American Judaism and the Jew, as was vouchsafed to but few men in the century, and blessed as he was with uncommon gifts and uncommon opportunities, he was easily induced, like his congregation, in its pride at having him as leader, to stand forth alone in self-sufficient power and glory, preferring to abide by his more radical views to co-operation with his colleagues of the Central Conference of American Rabbis; though he frequently gave full and free expression to his views at their sessions. Ardent advocate of enlightened Judaism as he was, he had little sympathy with the emotional elements, the mystic side of religion, the divine revelation being altogether conceived by him as an act of reason, in contradistinction to the theological system of Einhorn, the theologian par excellence among the Reform pioneers. From this same point of view he did not greatly value the ceremonial practices of Judaism which, with their symbolic significance, are in some form or other to foster and preserve our ancient heritage in the home as well as in the synagogue. Instead, Hirsch laid all stress on Israel's task as the exponent and promoter of the highest verities and ideals of humanity in the spirit of prophetic Judaism; and he loved all the more as Jew to work hand in hand with the leaders of radical liberalism in other religious denominations. The Zionistic movement he persistently opposed in the pulpit and in the press from its very beginning.

His last years were years of anxiety and ailment. His robust constitution gave way under the heavy burden of the toil he underwent during his lifetime. Especially did the harrowing effects of the war affect him. Only the celebration of his seventieth birthday, two years ago—which was made the occasion of a wondrous outburst of spontaneous homage

paid him by the representatives of the various classes and ranks of men all over the land and also from beyond the sea, expressive of the universal admiration and appreciation of his life-long efforts on behalf of Judaism and humanity,—endowed him for a time with new vigor and elasticity, enabling him to preach with the old fire. But he overtaxed his strength.

To the surprise of many, he joined the cause of the Free Synagogue of Stephen S. Wise, accepting the honorary Presidency of the Jewish Institute of Religion, fostered by the latter, going to New York to manifest in eloquent addresses his interest in the work disapproved by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. It was apparently his high opinion of the Berlin Hochschule which, in rejecting the restraint of a specific theological or rabbinical school, would offer the academic freedom of the University to both teachers and students, which appealed to him.

Alas! the collapse of his physical powers followed all too soon, and on January 7, 1923, Emil Gustave Hirsch passed away, mourned alike by Jew and Christian the world over as a prince among men. "The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life" for the generations that come after him; his soul has entered into the realm of God's beloved, who "shine like the brightness of the firmament, and like the stars, forever and aye."

In the death of Emil Gustave Hirsch, the eminent preacher and leader, the distinguished rabbi of Sinai Congregation of Chicago, and the wonderously gifted spokesman for American Judaism and the Jew, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, in common with all Jewry, mourns the passing of one of its truly great men and princes of Israel. Divine Providence singled him out among his contemporaries to stand forth as a unique force to glorify Judaism by the power of his masterful tongue and pen, and win a wide world for a better appreciation of its lofty idealism in the spirit of true *Kiddush ha-Shem*. He excelled, not merely by a rare comprehensive scholarship, but also as a gigantic toiler for the promotion of human welfare in both Jewish and non-Jewish circles. As an inspiring example to coming generations he will live in the annals of history,

and his colleagues of the Central Conference of American Rabbis will ever cherish his memory, as will Sinai Temple and the Chicago community, to whom they extend their warmest sympathy.

THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE OF YESTERDAY AND A GREAT DESIDERATUM IN ITS CURRICULUM TO-DAY

OUR Jubilee Celebration offers a two-fold aspect. Looking backward upon half a century's work, we find cause for thanksgiving and proud joy over what has been accomplished for the good of many. More solemn, however, is a glance forward into the future, as we realize what new tasks may be imposed upon us, and what new ideas and ideals will move us on to attain the success we look for. The Jubilee of the Hebrew Union College we are celebrating this year was to a large extent anticipated by the Jubilee of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations two years ago, when we all gloried in the unique achievements of the College under the guardianship of the Union, and voiced our gratitude to God, the Keeper of Israel, for having given us in Isaac M. Wise the great genius who created those institutions which have become the imperishable monuments for the preservation and propagation of our precious ancient heritage in this new land. Indeed, as a prominent Palestinian Rabbi pointing to the Babylonian Jewry once exclaimed: "We can no longer claim the glory of the Torah for ourselves; it is all theirs," so can American Israel well boast that its work for the Jewish faith and for Jewish learning bids fair to outdo that of European Jewry. Where else do you find hundreds of congregations in common with their Rabbis and lay leaders rallied as one soul around the banner of Progressive Judaism, eager to maintain, with all their might, the Torah as their centre and focus of light and truth for generations to come? Where do you find federations of men and women, young and old, bent upon the dissemination of our lofty truth in the hearts of all, as powerful in number, in zeal and influence as are ours? The very edifices of our College stand forth as majestic witnesses to the same. True, our sister institutions pursue the same aim and object; still, the initiative in all their endeavors was made under the auspices of our Union.

We have gone forward, working in conformity with the spirit of the immortal founder, and the others were bound to follow. Loyal to the principles and ideals of our glorious past, we have inscribed progress and freedom of inquiry upon our banner, and we have succeeded.

Exceedingly modest were its means and facilities, when the College was started by Dr. Wise, but, owing to his indomitable courage and energy and his wondrous resourcefulness, it grew from year to year in power and extent during the twenty-five years of his presidency. At first aided by his colleague Dr. Lilienthal, he soon acquired the valued services of Moses Mielziner, the eminent Talmudic scholar, and years afterwards a number of gifted men,—among whom Dr. Bittenwieser, the Bible Exegete, Sigmund Mannheimer, the Hebrew Grammarian, the scholarly Max Margolis, Henry Malter, Ephraim Feldman, Caspar Leviaas and last but not least the versatile and prominent historian Dr. Deutsch—formed his staff of teachers, Drs. Philipson and Grossman also assisting him as eminent members of the Faculty and as special lecturers. And how fortunate was he in at once finding the pupils after his own heart, who after the first graduation and subsequently went forth with the glow of enthusiasm of their master to open new fields of labor, broadening the scope of the pulpit, while carrying his inspiring messages to hundreds and thousands, Jew and Gentile, all over the land so as to render Reform Judaism a new power of rejuvenation for all.

It was my privilege—after a three years' interval, in which Dr. Mielziner and Dr. Deutsch functioned as acting Presidents—to become his successor in office, and during the eighteen and a half years of my presidency to more than equal the number of graduates Dr. Wise had sent forth. Greatly encouraged by the Board of Governors, I increased the number of courses of study, taking charge of some myself, and systematized the whole work in accordance with the new demands of our critical-historical age. The appointment of Prof. Lauterbach, the keen Talmudist, of Neumark, the renowned Jewish Philosopher, and the able Bible exegetes and Hebrew grammarians Julian Morgenstern and Henry Englander and Max Schloessinger gave a new

prestige to the College. I also introduced a series of lecturers in applied Sociology, Dr. Bogen having been the first lecturer, others following him.

And may I not also proudly refer to the imposing structure reared during my incumbency on the heights of the city, in close proximity to the University, testifying to the outward growth of our institution, and also to the splendid Library building donated by Isaac W. Bernheim, which under the able and most energetic librarian Adolph S. Oko became with its rich literary treasures an adequate auxiliary to the institution of learning, and now, thanks to the generosity of many donors, rivals the best Jewish libraries of the world.

The last three years have, owing to the successful efforts of my indefatigable successor Dr. Julian Morgenstern, seen the College working in new directions. Younger men, mostly graduates of our institution, occupy the different chairs alongside of the older professors, and the Gymnasium and the Dormitory, gracious gifts of Mrs. J. Walter Freiberg and of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods to encourage our students who have come in larger numbers, have risen to add to the splendor and attractiveness of the College. But what is of special importance, the financial condition is being so improved as to secure the permanency of the institution for all time. We have thus every reason for rejoicing in this Jubilee.

We must, however, not conceal from ourselves the fact brought out at the recent convention of the Union that the College is in a state of transition, and it requires all the wisdom and energy of the administration to bring it internally as well as externally up to the demands of the time. We must bear in mind that the character of the institution is no longer the same as it was at its foundation. At that time it was planned for a class of young students who had to go for four years through High School, and for another four years through the University of Cincinnati, and correspondingly, there was established the Preparatory department, with its elementary courses, and subsequently the Collegiate Department with its advanced studies, through both of which they had to pass before graduation and ordination as Rabbis. A ninth year was added by me to

afford the students more time for their graduation work. Since then other students, many of them College or University graduates, entered our institution better prepared for a more comprehensive grasp of the subjects taught. And today most of the students are of this calibre. These were accommodated by the addition of morning lectures to the regular afternoon lessons. But, after all, the whole system of study must be expanded to answer the higher demands of life. Thus for instance, the course of philosophy, in order to be up to date, must take full cognizance of our modern systems such as Bergson's and Wm. James', as in fact it did under the comprehensive system of the unforgettable Neumark, and not merely dwell on our mediaeval systems of thought, whether that of Maimonides which is based on Aristotle, or any other. So does the teaching of the Talmud and the Codes become profitable for us, who are no longer bound to the *Shulhan Aruk*, only when such practical questions as the marriage and divorce laws, the funeral and mourning rites, or the Sabbath and Festivals are discussed, so as to be brought into relation to modern life, and this is also actually done by Dr. Lauterbach. Nor is the mere recording of the historical and biographical facts sufficient for the course on history; the students must obtain a deeper insight into the philosophy of history and the deeper forces moving the various periods in order to learn to understand our own time with its problems. In short, not to go further into detail, the higher courses should come into closer touch with life.

And here is the point I have particularly in mind. To be sure, we American Jews no longer live in seclusion. Our life is interwoven by a thousand threads with that of the surrounding world. Even those who still observe the dietary laws do not want to be alienated, as ex-President Eliot suggests, from the rest of men. Our whole thinking, reading and speaking brings us into closest contact with our non-Jewish fellow citizens, and we are constantly confronted with the question: what is, and should be, our attitude as Jews towards the Christian world. Only blind fanatics and fools speak of the unbridgeable gulf between Jews and Gentiles. Even the Middle Ages, with all their hostility to

us, found or sought ways of approach, if not socially, then by means of scientific cooperation and competition. And today when we see a majestic Cathedral rise in our midst, with the motto: "The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Men" rallying all the creeds in friendship around it, we ought to have a better mutual understanding of each other's idealism and faith than we had hitherto. Yet nowhere is this demand felt so clearly as in our seats of learning, where the students are trained for the leadership of Congregations as ministers. It was well said the other day by Cardinal Hayes: "Tolerance is not enough." What we need today is mutual recognition. Much as we differ from each other in our creeds and doctrines or rites, we have a great deal in common, and we can well afford to learn from each other. If reason is the predominant force of our faith, there are sentiment and mysticism prevalent in the Church. Judaism has made science the sister of our faith; Christianity allied art with its religion. The mighty passion for justice is the characteristic of the Jew throughout the ages, whereas Christianity laid all the stress on love.

We can well understand why the New Testament became a *Noli me tangere* to the Jew, and why the very name of Jesus was shunned by them all these centuries. As soon as the man Jesus was deified, the law forbidding the very mention of the name of other gods (Exodus XXIII, 13) was applied to him, too, and so were the Jews actually called *deicides* or Christ-killers and laden with curses by the New Testament writers. Nor was there any attempt made by the ruling Church to establish friendlier relations with the maligned race. Only our own great mediaeval authorities took a broader view, and beheld in Christianity, as well as in Mohammedanism, God-appointed agencies for the spreading of the Jewish truth over the world. We today have obtained a better knowledge of the sources and of the accomplishments of the Christian faith, and it is in our own interest to learn to know more about them. After all, the New Testament, centered on Jesus as the saviour, has, notwithstanding all its Jew-hatred and malicious charges against the Jews, won the pagan world for Israel's God and for the higher ethics rooted in the belief in Him.

Moreover, ever so many phrases of the New Testament have become parts of our ordinary language in Western civilization.

From whatever point then we may look at it, it becomes the imperative duty of the Jewish student in our days to familiarize himself with the New Testament as an off-shoot of Judaism. We proudly claim Jesus as our own, even if we cannot go as far as does Claude Montefiore who wants to raise him to the rank of Israel's great prophets. Likewise should the Jewish teacher be acquainted with the principal facts of Church history as it affected the destinies of the whole Western civilization. This study ought to find a place in the curriculum of the Jewish College, and accordingly there should be a certain time fixed for a course on the Relations between Judaism and Christianity in the past and at the present time.

No Jewish minister today can fail to come in touch with his Christian fellows, whether through the press or in personal conversation, and he owes it to himself, as well as to the sacred cause he represents, to be fully prepared and able to stand up in defense of our faith as its fairminded champion, while maintaining a firm scientific footing in accord with the best results of modern research. Very frequently he is called upon to discuss themes pertaining to those relations, and there he finds the opportunity of enlightening his non-Jewish hearers on many points new to them, and this requires a systematic training.

Of course, it would be a great boon to the College, nay, a real *Kiddush ha-Shem*, if some generous philanthropist, in honor of its Jubilee, would endow a Chair devoted to this purpose, or to Comparative Religion in general, though it is not easy to find a scholar particularly fitted for the task. In the meantime, those of our Rabbis might step in, who possess the necessary knowledge and practical wisdom to start the work, and deliver different series of discourses to initiate the students, say the Seniors and Juniors, into the subject. There are also many outsiders here and abroad, who would gladly aid in the enterprise, in order to bring Jew and Gentile nearer together. The promotion of good-will among the representatives of these two religions, highly

laudable in itself, is not enough. It requires action. Our own efforts in its behalf will work as an incentive to others. So let us be up and doing. How beautiful are the words of the last prophet in that respect: "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My name is great among the nations, and in every place offerings are presented unto My name, for My name is great among the nations, says the Lord of hosts" (Mal. I, 11).

But there is another point which requires our utmost consideration. The Committee on the work of the College at the St. Louis Convention was quite in order, when laying special stress on the need of greater spirituality on the part of the students and the teachers, and there were reasons for their doing so. We must not overlook the patent fact that the advanced studies have their own pit-falls. Too often does greater intellectuality in our faith lessen the spiritual view of things, engendering irreverence and doubt, and the future leaders, who are expected by their enthusiasm and zeal to kindle the fire of faith in their hearers, have often nothing but cold reason to offer which only criticizes and disregards the past.

Some of these clamor for an unbridled liberalism which declares the very foundations of religion, such as are God and immortality, to be matters of doubt, and humility no longer finds a place in their system of ethics. In vain we ask for the manifestation of the spirit that made our great seers, singers and sages the messengers of the living God, and which gave the Jew the power to outlive the ages. Nor is there any room in their system for prayer, the power that uplifts man above the earth and links him to the throne of the Most High to enable him to brave adversity; their Reform, instead of regenerating the faith, is but degeneracy, barren phraseology. Yea, disregarding history and psychology, they tell us that no religion has the right to claim any higher value than the other, seeing as they do, in religion only a man-made product, not a dynamic force, superior to the visible cosmos. Utilitarianism, which today rules our sciences, is also the determining factor of the soul's life for these ultra-liberalists, and holiness is stricken out of their vocabulary. It is high time to overcome these tendencies in

our College, and cry out with Moses of yore: "Would that the whole people of God become prophets, as He lays His spirit upon them." Yes, prophets we need, men of the spirit, men of vision, not of mere mentality, men who proclaim Judaism, as did the great seer of the exile, as the light of the nations and as the covenant inter-linking the peoples, the races and the creeds. The College must give us men who embody in their life the faith they preach, and who make their Jewish hearers feel that our truth is the power that is to conquer the world.

IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

A SUPPLEMENTAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF
DR. KAUFMANN KOHLER*

BY MAX J. KOHLER

- 1—Protokolle der Rabbiner Konferenz, Philadelphia, Nov. 3-6, 1869. Contains 'Recommendations' of Dr. Kohler at pp. 63-6, and *in passim* (N. Y. 1870).
- 2—Worte an der Bahre von Leopold Oppenheimer, gesprochen am 30 März, 1876 n. p. (New York: Staatszeitung Job Pr. Co. 1876) 8 p.
- 3—Origin of the Sabbath. Chicago, 1876, pp. 11-21, reprinted in Reform Advocate May 29, 1926.
- 4—Purim und Fastnacht. Westen (Chicago) Feb. 1877 (?).
- 5—Lectionen für die Confirmanden in Tempel Beth-El, New York. (New York, 1880).
- 6—Leichenrede am Sarge der Frau Hannah Falk, gehalten am 22sten Januar, 1882 (New York. Al. L. Goetzel 1882) 4 p. and portrait.
- 7—Chronology of Events of Interest to Jews in American Jews' Annual for 1884-5 pp. 56-65.
- 8—Chapters on Folk-Lore and Popular Customs.
I—New Year's Customs—Eating Sweet Things.

*In 1913, Mr. Adolph S. Oko, Librarian of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, contributed a valuable bibliography of Dr. Kohler's writings 1867-1913 to the volume, *Studies in Jewish Literature*, issued on the occasion of Dr. Kohler's Seventieth birthday (pp. 266-301). It contained 801 items, including 288 articles which appeared in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*. It is the purpose of the present paper to supplement the same as far as possible. Dr. Kohler continued to be a prolific writer until he died on January 28th, 1926, and an effort has been made herein to list all these subsequent items. Moreover, as stated in Mr. Oko's paper, various items escaped his attention, and it is sought to include these herein. In some instances, Mr. Oko printed merely the title of a series of articles, without itemizing the separate chapter headings, which appear herein as separate items. A chronological order of arrangement has been adopted, occasionally slightly modified where a whole series is involved. Mr. Oko himself kindly furnished some of the items listed herein.

- II—Taschlich (Sabbath Visitor, Sept. 1884 et/seq. Vol. 13, pp. 81-2).
(Series listed by Oko as Nos. 181 and 198a).
- 9—Idem. About Sneezing.
The Moses-Fish.
The Messiah Bird (1884) pp. 97-98.
- 10—Idem. Rites and Observances Pertaining to the Day of Atonement (1884), pp. 112-113.
- 11—Idem. Rites and Observances Connected with the Feast of Booths (1884) p. 129.
- 12—Idem. The Feast of Rejoicing in the Law—A Plea for a Children's Feast, (1884), pp. 147, 150.
- 13—Idem. Fish Stories, (1884) p. 176.
- 14—Idem. Dog Stories (1884) pp. 193-4.
- 15—Idem. The Bird of Immortality, (1884) pp. 209-10.
- 16—Idem. Rabbi Judah the Pious of Regensburg and Pope Urban, (1884) pp. 257-258.
- 17—Idem. Chanukkah and Christmas (1884) pp. 305-6.
- 18—Idem. All for the Good—Vol. 14, (1885) pp. 53-4 (Title changed to Jewish Folk-Lore and Popular Customs).
- 19—Idem. Valentine's Day and the Fifteenth Day of Shebat (1885) Do. 77-8.
- 20—Idem. The Saint's Fellow-Men in Paradise—Rabbi Broka, St. Paphnutius and Rashi, Do. 91-2, 103-4.
- 21—Idem. Purim and Carnival (1885) Id. 113-14, 127-8.
- 22—Idem. Wondrous Resuscitations by Maimonides, Theophrastus, Virgil and Others. (1885?).
- 23—Historical Lessons for the Senior Class.
I—Introductory Lesson, I am a Jew, Sabbath Visitor (1884) Vol. 13, pp. 114-5. Series listed by Oko as No. 184.
- 24—Idem. II—Review of Biblical History, Idem pp. 130-1.
- 25—Idem. III—Ezra—The Founder of the Second Commonwealth of Judea. Idem, pp. 162-3.
- 26—Idem. IV—The Mosaic Law, Idem pp. 211-2.
- 27—Idem. The Holy Scriptures and their Composition, Idem, pp. 273-5.
- 28—Post-Biblical History in Biographies.
I—Simon the Just, Vol. 14 (1885), pp. 20-1; 32.
(Series listed by Oko as No. 202.)

- 29—Idem. II—Aristobulus in Alexandria and Antigonus in Jerusalem, Id. 44-6.
- 30—Idem. III—Judas Maccabaeus, Id. —54-6, 67-8, 79-80.
- 31—Idem. IV—Alexander Jannaeus and Simon the Son of Shetach, pp. 93-4, 104-5, 115-7.
- 32—Idem. V—The Last Hasmonian Rulers, pp. 129-130.
- 33—Idem. VI—Herod and Hillel, pp. 163-4, 175-6, 186-7, 199-200, 211-12.
- 34—Idem. VII—Jesus of Nazareth, pp. 233-4, 246-7.
- 35—Concerted Action in Sabbath School Reform. In Jewish Ministers Association of New York and Adjacent States. Conference Papers. N. Y. 1885, pp. 1-23. Same item as listed by Oko in other form as No. 204.
- 36—Proceedings of the Pittsburgh Rabbinical Conference, November 16-18, 1885. Published by the Central Conference of American Rabbis in honor of the 80th anniversary of the birth of Rabbi Kaufmann Kohler. Pamphlet 1923; includes Conference Paper by Dr. Kohler. Reprinted from The Jewish Reformer (New York) 1885.
- 37—Article on Unfermented Wine, written for Wilbur F. Craft's column in the newspaper Christian Herald (?). 1885 (?).
- 38—Kohler to Morais. American Hebrew Sept. 9, 1887, in answer to S. Morais in American Hebrew, Sept. 2, 1887.
- 39—In Memory of Dr. Samuel Hirsch. Memorial Address May 19, 1889. From pamphlet: Hirsch, Samuel. In Memory of Dr. S. Hirsch. (Chicago 1889), pp. 5-9; Also in same pamphlet pp. 18-22 Leichenrede für Dr. Samuel Hirsch.
- 40—Worte der Trauer und des Trostes. Gesprochen an der Bahre der Frau Babette Morgenthau am 16ten August 1892. New York. J. Goldman 1892.
- 41—Instruction in Biblical History. In Guide for Jewish Sabbath School Teachers. Issued by the Hebrew Sabbath School Union, 1893 (?) pp. 1-57.
- 42—Worte der Trauer und des Trostes für Frau Sigmund Oppenheimer March 12, 1893, N. Y.

- 43—Dr. Kohler's oration on Rev. Henry S. Jacobs (Oko Bibliography No. 331, listing item from the American Hebrew of 1893) now reprinted in Israel Goldstein's *A Century of Judaism in New York* (1930) pp. 205-7.
- 44—Concluding prayer (at the Jesse Seligman Memorial Service). In Seligman, Jesse (b. 1827 d. 1894). In *Memoriam New York 1894*, (pp. 106-8). Also Extract from Sermon, p. 73.
- 45—Sermons by American Rabbis published by the Central Conference of American Rabbis (1896) contains Dr. Kohler's, *The Glory of Religion* (pp. 47-51) and *The Need of a Living Creed* (pp. 217-222).
- 46—Is there a Specifically American Judaism?? From *Pacific Jewish Annual*, Vol. I (1897) pp. 53-61, San Francisco.
- 47—Judaism's Men of Mark—Hillel the Babylonian, *American Hebrew* Jan. 22-29, 1897.
- 48—The Ninth of Ab. Sermon. *American Hebrew*. 1896, p. 163.
- 49—Predigt zum Andenken am Alexander Kohut. (In: Kohut, Alexander, b. 1842, d. 1894). Tribute to the memory of A. Kohut. New York, 1894. p. 16-23.
- 50—The New Talmud Translation by Rodkinson & Wise. *American Hebrew* 1896, pp. 272-4. Same as listed by Oko in other form as No. 366.
- 51—Rejoinder to Rodkinson & Wise *American Hebrew* 1896, p. 457. Same as listed by Oko in other form as No. 367.
- 52—Address on Jewish Ideals at a banquet in honor of Joseph Jacobs—*Am. Heb.* Nov. 18, 1896.
- 53—Zionism: Address March 3, 1898. *Judaean Addresses*, 1897-9, pp. 68-86. (N. Y. 1899).
- 54—In Memoriam Babette Hornthal. Funeral Address Oct. 28, 1900.
- 55—A United Israel. Conference Lecture 1898. Central Conference of American Rabbis Year Book, Volume for 1898-9. Listed by Oko in other form as No. 410.
- 56—N. Y. Board of Ministers Report of President, *American Hebrew* 1897 (?) pp. 269-271.

- 57—Funeral Address for Rev. Leon Sternberger. American Hebrew. 1897, pp. 338-9.
- 58—Sermon at Celebration of the 35th Anniversary of the Institution of Sunday Lectures in Sinai Congregation, Chicago, January 15, 1899. In pamphlet, Report of the Sermon (pp. 15-22); also Response at Banquet, pp. 69-71 Compare *Oko* No. 408.
- 59—Publicans and Sinners as Viewed by the Rabbis Sunday School Times March 3, 1900.
- 60—Funeral Address for Dr. S. Waterman in Menorah Monthly Vol. 36 (1899) pp. 270-1.
- 61—The American Jew in Interstate Grocer 1900 (?).
- 62—Jesus of Nazareth from the Present Jewish Point of View in Croly's Tarry Thou Till I Come, published by Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1901. Appendix, pp. 553-5.
- 63—Zachariah Frankel—address in pamphlet on him (pp. 36-8), consisting of addresses by Drs. G. Deutsch, L. Ginzberg and K. Kohler (1902) Compare *Oko* No. 425.
- 64—The Mission of the Jewish Encyclopedia. Address delivered May 21, 1901 at a meeting in honor of the Jewish Encyclopedia. In Judaeian Addresses, Selected. (Vol. II, 1900-1917) (N. Y. 1917). Same item as listed by *Oko* in other form as No. 421.
- 65—Jewish Burial and Disinterment. A Letter. American Hebrew. March 1902, p. 54.
- 66—The College and the Seminary—Address at Dedication of Building of Seminary, April 26, 1903, in Jewish Theological Seminary of America's Biennial Reports 1904, pp. 120-3.
- 67—Ahad-Ha-Am-ism an Anachronism. American Hebrew 1904, pp. 767-8. Answer to Dr. Schechter on Zionism in April 15, 1904 issue of same paper, p. 635.
- 68—What a Jewish Institution of Learning should be. Inaugural address . . . in Hebrew Union College Ceremonies at the Installation of Rev. Dr. Kaufmann Kohler as president of the Hebrew Union College October 18, 1903, Cincinnati, O. (1903), pp. 13-36. Same as listed in other form by *Oko* as No. 442.
- 69—New Curriculum of the Hebrew Union College. Cincinnati, May and Kreidler (1904) 7 (1) pp.

- 70—Views on the Synod. Compiled by Committee of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (1905). Dr. Kohler's views at pp. 74-5.
- 71—Report on Prof. Margolis' paper on Theological Aspect of Reform Judaism and on his Motion to have a Creed of Reformed Judaism prepared for Final Adoption by A Synod in Central Conference of American Rabbis Year Book, Vol. 15, pp. 83-102 (1905) and pamphlet reprint. Listed in other form by Oko as No. 460.
- 72—Testimony in Cohen vs. Congregation Shearith Israel in the City of New York 114 N. Y. Appellate Division 117 (1906) affirmed in 189 N. Y. 528 as to right to disinter from a Jewish Cemetery, in order to re-inter in a new family plot. Case on Appeal, contained in N. Y. City Bar Association, Vol. 1907. Court of Appeals—415-113 pp. 80-9.
- 73—Samson Raphael Hirsch in Year Book Central Conference of American Rabbis, Vol. 18, (1908) pp. 210-14.
- 74—Reform does not lead to Christianity. Article for Silver Jubilee number of Jewish Daily News. March 20, 1910.
- 75—American Judaism as Represented by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Hebrew Union College. Address before the Council of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations Jan. 18, 1911. In New York daily and Jewish weekly papers following; reprinted in reports of Union of American Hebrew Congregations and in 1916 in Hebrew Union College & Other Addresses pp. 195-213.
- 76—Der Deutsche Kaiser als Weltbürger—Sonntagsblatt, Cincinnati. Volksblatt Jan. 28, 1912.
- 77—Eulogies on Mr. & Mrs. Isidor Straus. Reform Advocate. Vol. 43, pp. 470-1. (May 4, 1912.)
- 78—Eulogy on Mrs. Dr. M. Landsberg. Reform Advocate, Vol. 43, pp. 470-1. (May 4, 1912.)
- 79—How to Teach Biblical History. Delivered before the Jewish Religious School Union. Am. Hebrew (Year ?) pp. 571-2.
- 80—The Threefold Purpose of the Synagogue—Address

- delivered at the Dedication of the New Sinai Temple, Chicago, March 1, 1913, *Reform Advocate*, reprinted in *Hebrew Union College and Other Addresses*, pp. 133-142.
- 81—Die Malkisedek Episode in Genesis XIV in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie u. Verwandte Gebiete* Vol. 28 (1913), pp. 364-370), and reprint, (Strassburg K. J. Trubner, 1913, pp. 364-370).
- 82—Address at the ordination of graduates of the Hebrew Union College, (June 14, 1913) in *Reform Advocate*, Vol. 45 (1913), p. 679. Also in *Union Bulletin*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 8-11 (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1913).
- 83—Isaac Mayer Wise, founder and first president of the Conference, 1889-1900. Symposium addresses commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, Detroit, Mich. 1914 (Cincinnati 1914) reprinted from *Central Conference American Rabbis' Year Book*, Vol. 24 (1914) pp. 224-9.
- 84—The New Bible Translation, given at dinner in celebration of the conclusion of the Bible translation in N. Y. Feb. 10, 1914, (reprinted in *Hebrew Union College and Other Addresses*, pp. 267-271) from *American Hebrew*, Vol. 94 (1914), p. 448, *Jewish Exponent*.
- 85—Ordination Address. *Hebrew Union College Monthly*, Vol. 1 No. 1 June, 1914, pp. 6-9.
- 86—Greetings to newly-founded *Menorah Journal* Vol. I, No. 1, (Jan. 1915), pp. 6-7.
- 87—Samuel Hirsch—A Historical Study: in Samuel Hirsch 100th Anniversary No. of *Reform Advocate* May 29/15, pp. 507-11.
- 88—The Scholar & the Preacher—*Hebrew Union College Monthly*, Nov. 1914, Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 4-7.
- 89—The Peace Mission of Judaism, Oct. 1914 (Address reprinted in *Hebrew Union College and Other Addresses*, pp. 99-108) from *Jewish Exponent* Vol. 60, (1914) No. 2, p. 1-2, *Reform Advocate*, Vol. 48, (1914) p. 294-6, *American Israelite*, Oct. 22, 1914. Also *Emanu-El* (San Francisco), Vol. 39, pp. 1, 5, 12.

- 90—Solomon Schechter: Memorial Address, Dec. 18, 1915. Hebrew Union College Monthly, Vol. II, No. 4 (Jan. 1915), and in Hebrew Union College & Other Addresses, p. 323 et seq.
- 91—Harmonization of the Jewish and Civil Laws of Marriage & Divorce in Year Book of the Central Conference of American Rabbis Vol. 25 (1915), pp. 335–378 and reprint.
- 92—Dr. Wise, Master Builder of American Judaism—Hebrew Union College Monthly, Vol. 1, No. 7 (April 1915) pp. 1–3.
- 93—The Sabbath and Festivals in Pre-Exilic and Exilic Times in Journal of the American Oriental Society Vol. 37, pp. 209–223 (1917) and pamphlet reprint (New Haven, 1917), also Hebrew Union College Monthly, Vol. III, No. 7 (May, 1917).
- 94—The Views and Principles of American Reform Judaism and its Outlook in these Critical Times. Address Sept. 25, 1915. Hebrew Union College Monthly, Vol. II, No. 2 (Nov. 1915) pp. 71–5.
- 95—The Jewish Heart, Home & Heritage, (Jewish Community Bulletin of Cincinnati, 1915?).
- 96—The Hebrew Union College and Other Addresses, Cincinnati, 1916, pp. 336.
- 97—The Reform Movement and Russian Intellectuals American Jewish Chronicle (1916 ?) pp. 103, 127.
- 98—Faith of Reform Judaism in Menorah Journal, Feb' 1916, pp. 8–15.
- 99—The Staff of Priesthood and the Staff of Leadership, Hebrew Union College Monthly, June 1916. Vol. II, No. 9, pp. 309–19.
- 100—What the Hebrew Union College Stands For (Hebrew Union College Monthly, Nov. 1916) Vol. III, No. 1.
- 101—The Jew in Medicine. Lecture given before the Ecclecltical Medical College students of Cincinnati, Feb. 1916. Reform Advocate, Vol. 51, No. 16, May 27, 1916, pp. 541–6.
- 102—Moses' Great Wish—Graduation Address (Hebrew Union College Monthly of June 1917) Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 33–5.

- 103—A Training School of Rabbis for American Judaism. Jewish Comment, Jan. 12, 1917.
- 104—The Halakik Portions in Josephus' Antiquities (IV: 8, 5-43). (Hebrew Union College Monthly Feb. 1917) Vol. III, No. 4.
- 105—Hellenism & Judaism. (Hebrew Union College Monthly, Nov. 1917), Vol. IV, pp. 51-63.
- 106—Teachers' Institute Commencement Address May 1917 (Union Bulletin, May, 1917).
- 107—Charity Among the Jews in B. D. Bogen's Jewish Philanthropy, Macmillan Co., N. Y. 1917, pp. 16-26.
- 108—Judaism's Four Characteristic Traits, Loyalty and Universality, Rationality and Spirituality. Union Bulletin, Oct. 1917, also Bnai B'rith News 1917; also in Jewish Comment, Vol. 50, No. 3, pp. 49-51.
- 109—Address at Installation of Rabbi Abba Silver in Cleveland Jewish Review & Observer Oct. 5, 1917.
- 110—Memorial Address for Edward L. Heinsheimer (Hebrew Union College Monthly, Jan. 1918).
- 111—Palestine & Israel's World Mission. Pittsburgh March 31, 1918 (Pamphlet of 12 pages).
- 112—Israel's God, the God of History; Israel's Religion, the Religion of History (Heb. Union College Monthly, Dec. 1918), Vol. V, No. 1; also "American Israelite," Oct. 17, 1918; "Reform Advocate," Oct. 12, 1918.
- 113—Ordination Address (Union Bulletin June 1918).
- 114—Jewish Theology, Systematically and Historically Considered. N. Y. 1918; pp. 503.
- 115—Personal Reminiscences of My Early Life (in Hebrew Union College Monthly May, 1918; and reprint).
- 116—The Attitude of Reform Judaism Towards the Recent Occurrences in Palestine (Jewish Comment, March 29, 1918; and Reform Advocate, April 6, 1918).
- 117—Eulogy for Joseph E. Sales. Hebrew Union College Monthly, Vol. V, No. 3, Feb. 1919.
- 118—The Spirit of God (Hebrew Union College Monthly, April 1919) Vol. V, No. 5.
- 119—The Mission of Israel and its Application to Modern Times (Central Conference of American Rabbis Year

- Book, Vol. 29, 1919, pp. 265-88) and reprint, pamphlet of 43 pages.
- 120—The Tetragrammaton (Shem Ham Mforesh) and its Uses. (Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy, Jan. 1919) I pp. 19-32, and reprint.
- 121—Shema Yisroel—Origin and Purpose of its Daily Recital (Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy, Vol. 1 (June—Oct. 1919). pp. 255-26 and reprint.
- 122—The New Testament from the Point of View of Jewish Research, (Hebrew Union College Monthly, Dec. 1919), Jan. 1920, Vol. 6, Nos. 2 and 3.
- 123—The Call to American Jews—American Hebrew N. Y. 1919, Vol. 40, pp. 581; 606; 612.
- 124—The Need of a Great Unifying Power. Union Bulletin. Cincinnati, 1919, Vol. 9, No. 5 pp. 1, 8 and Reform Advocate Oct. 25, 1919.
- 125—A Pioneer of Reform Judaism—David Einhorn and his Place in American Jewish Life (Jewish Tribune, Jan. 1920?).
- 126—Ordination Address (Hebrew Union College Monthly, May—June, 1920) Vol. VI, No. 6, pp. 171-4.
- 127—The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature (Jewish Quarterly Review N. S. Vol. 11 (1920) pp. 145-168 and reprint of 24 pages.
- 128—Reminiscences of Jacob H. Schiff, Union Bulletin, October, 1920.
- 129—Ordination Address—The Lord is My Banner—1921 (Hebrew Union College Monthly, Vol. 7, May—June, 1921).
- 130—Bernhard Felsenthal—A Felsenthal Centenary Address—Reform Advocate, Dec. 31, 1921, p. 507.
- 131—Memorial Address in honor of the late Jacob H. Schiff, Jan. 15, 1921 (Pamphlet).
- 132—Address on the Opening of the College, Oct. 22, 1921 (Hebrew Union College Monthly, Dec. 1921, pp. 40-4).
- 133—On Emil G. Hirsch's 70th Birthday in Reform Advocate—Emil G. Hirsch 70th Birthday Issue May 21/21, p. 377.
- 134—Farewell Sermon May, 1922, Israel's Solidarity, Reform Judaism and the Hebrew Union College. (Hebrew

- Union College Monthly, Vol. VIII No. 8, June 1922, pp. 221-7; also Union Bulletin June-July, 1922).
- 135—The Requirements of a True Religious Leader—(Hebrew Union College Monthly, Nov. 1922) Vol. IX, No. 1, pp. 10-13.
- 136—On Congress' Resolution anent Palestine as the National Home of the Jewish Race. (American Hebrew May 5, 1922).
- 137—The Origin of Kol Nidre. (American Hebrew, Dec. 8, 1922.)
- 138—In Memory of Winifred L. Kohler. Dec. 1922. Prayer at Funeral (in Privately Printed Pamphlet).
- 139—Heaven and Hell in Comparative Religion, with Special Reference to Dante's Divine Comedy. N. Y. 1923; pp. 158.
- 140—A Tribute to Dr. Emil G. Hirsch, American Hebrew, Jan. 12, 1923.
- 141—Necrology of Emil G. Hirsch in Central Conference of American Rabbis' Year Book, 1923. pp. 145-154, Vol. XXXIII.
- 142—American Reform Judaism. Am. Hebrew, Jan. 19, 1923.
- 143—Address before Council of Union of American Hebrew Congregations N. Y. Jan. 1923. Daily and Jewish weekly papers of period, and Reports of Union of Am. Heb. Congregations.
- 144—The Vanguard (Hebrew Union College Monthly) (June 1923) Vol. IX, No. 7, pp. 11-19.
- 145—The Hasidim & Essenes (Jewish Guardian, London, Aug. 24, 1923).
- 146—In the Beginning (Hebrew Union College Monthly, Nov. 1923, Vol. X, No. 1, pp. 4-7.
- 147—Nathan Straus on his 75th Birthday. (Jewish Tribune Feb. 2, 1923, p. 14).
- 148—Address at 50th Anniversary of Temple Beth-El, Feb. 16, 1924 (Summary in American Hebrew).
- 149—The Great Need of our Times (Hebrew Union College Monthly, June-July 1924) Vol. X, No. 8, pp. 1-2.
- 150—A Revaluation of Reform Judaism—A symposium; Introduction by Dr. K. Kohler from Central Con-

- ference of American Rabbis' Year Book, Vol. 34, (1924), and reprint, pp. 3-10.
- 151—How to Live Long—By Those Who Know—Contribution to Symposium by Dr. K. Kohler in N. Y. Times, Sunday, July 13, 1924.
- 152—Origin and Composition of the 18 Benedictions, with a Translation of the Corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. 1 (1924) and reprint of 39 pages.
- 153—Tribute to Israel Abrahams—American Hebrew—October 9, 1925 and Jewish Tribune Oct. 16, 1925.
- 154—The Hebrew Union College of Yesterday and a Great Desideratum in its Curriculum Today (Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume 1925) and reprint of 8 pages.
- 155—Founders of the Synagogue (Menorah Journal, Aug. 1925. Vol. XI. No. 4, pp. 371-6.
- 156—My Reminiscences of Temple Beth El, Detroit in Detroit Jewish Chronicle, Dec. 1925.
- 157—Letter from Dr. K. Kohler printed in Woodbrooke Studies Vol. I, Christian Documents in Syrian, Arabic, and Gershtine ed. by A. Mingass, in Introduction by Dr. Rendel Harris to Jeremiah Apocriphon, pp. 134-5 (1827). Letter by Dr. K. Kohler written about 1889 regarding Rest of the Words of Baruch.
- 158—The Lesson from Tutankh-Amon's Tomb for the Jew (on occasion of celebration of his 80th birthday, April 29, 1923) in Judaeans III (1927).
- 159—The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church. Edited with a biographical essay by Dr. H. G. Enelow, Macmillan Co., 1929, 297 pp. Memorial Volume, published by the Alumni of the Hebrew Union College.
- 160—Responsa for the Central Conference of American Rabbis Year Book. Vol. 23 (1913) pp. 166-191.
- A. Liturgy—Reading of the Torah, pp. 167-170.
- B. The Bar Mitzvah Ceremony, pp. 170-3.
- C. The Kaddish Recital, pp. 173-176.
- D. Mourning Customs in General, pp. 176-179.
- E. Concerning Weddings, pp. 179-182.
- F. The Shofar Blowing on a Sabbath Day, pp. 182-3.
- 161—Vol. 24 (1914) pp. 151-156.

Standing During the Recital of the Kaddish, p. 152.

Can a Distinction be made between the Dead, p. 153.

The Educational Value of the Jahrzeit, p. 153.

Forbidden Marriages, pp. 153-4.

Burial of Non-Jewish Wives in Jewish Cemeteries, p. 154.

162—Vol. 26 (1916) p. 133-134—Burial of non-Jewish husbands or wives in Jewish Cemeteries.

163—Vol. 27 (1917) pp. 87-9.

(a) Prohibition of marriage (in Rhode Island) of a nephew to his aunt (step-aunt).

(b) Burial Rites.

164—Vol. 28 (1918) pp. 117-127.

(1) Should Rabbi name child which is Nolah Mohul (p. 117).

(2) Should Rabbi officiate at funeral of Christian Scientist (pp. 117-119).

(3) Should orthodox Jew bare head at singing of America (pp. 119-124).

(4) Need Jewish soldier observe dietary laws while in active service (pp. 124-7).

165—Vol. 29 (1919) pp. 74-95.

(1) Shall a Rabbi Officiate at a Mixed Marriage (pp. 75-6).

(2) Religion of Child of a Mixed Marriage (pp. 76-7).

(3) Burial of a Non-Jew in a Jewish Cemetery (pp. 77-8).

166—**משיג התיאולוגיה** A translation into Hebrew of the first chapter of his Jewish Theology by Joshua Bloch in Hadeborah (Hebrew monthly) ed. by G. Rosenzweig, vol. 1, No. 10, August 1912, p. 4.

V. NOTES

NOTES

I

HELLENISM AND JUDAISM

Reprinted from Hebrew Union College Monthly, vol. IV, 2 (November, 1917), pp. 51-63.

THE ESSENES AND THE APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

Reprinted from the Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series, vol. XI, 2 (1920), pp. 145-168.

* 1. R. H. Charles, *A critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity, or Hebrew, Jewish and Christian Eschatology from Preprophetic times till the close of the New Testament Canon*, 2nd ed., A. and Ch. Black, 1913.

2. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch, with an Introductory* by W. O. S. Oesterley, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London 1917.

3. F. Crawford Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, The Schweich Lectures*, 1913, London, 1914.

¹ Schechter refers to the term ספרים החיצוניים (Sanh. X, 1) in R. Akiba's dictum: "He also (has no share in the world to come) who reads (in public) from the 'extraneous' books." But as is evidenced by דרך 'Ben Zoma is still outside the pale of doctrinal Judaism', the term denotes heretics, aa Babl. Sanh. 100b correctly explains it: ספרי המינים. Thus Alfasi still reads, while the Christian censor had it changed into הצדוקים. The text in Jer. Sanh. 28a is corrupt, as was shown by Joel, Blicke in d. Religions-gesch., I, 70-76, and should read אף הקורא בספרים החיצונים כגון ספרי הרמס (= the Hermes books, not המירוס) וכגון ספר בן תולא וספר בן לענה אבל ספר בן סירא וכל הספרים שנכתבו מכאן ואילך הקורא בהן כקורא באגדה. A later deprecation of Ben Sira (Sanh. 100b, previously quoted as one of the Kethubim (see Schechter, JQR., III, 682) seems to have caused the corrupt reading in the Talmud Jer. as well as in Koheleth R. to XII, 12.

² The passage reads: ר' יודן: ריב'ו ור'ע חר אמר העה'ו גלה לו אבל הע'הב: והע'הב גלה לו; לא גלה לו. ואוחרנא אמר אחד הע'הו והע'הב גלה לו comp. also Midrash Lekah Tob. Akiba's longing after the Messianic time finds its characteristic expression in his declaration of the Song of Songs as 'the most holy of all the Writings' (Yadayim, III, 5).

³ While Hegesippus (Eusebius, H. Ch. II, 23, 17) tells of 'a Rechabite priest' who championed the cause of James the Elder at his martyrdom, and Jose ben Halafta claims to have descended from Jonadab ben Rekhab (Yer. Ta'an. IV, 68a), we find in Benjamin of Tudela's travels,

p. 70, a description of the Bne Rekhav as a warlike tribe inhabiting the province of Thema in South Arabia, and bent in common with their Arabian neighbours on predatory expeditions, Abraham Yagel's *Yaar ha-Lebanon*, quoted by Neubauer, *JQR.*, I, 411-13, refers to the Rechabites together with the Ten Tribes and the children of Moses, all living beyond the river Sambation; likewise Jacob Saphir in his *Eben Saphir*, I, 96, and Joseph Schwarz in his *Holy Land* (Germ. Transl., p. 107), who mention them by the name given them by the Arabs, of Yehud Hebr, that is descendants of Heber the Kenite (Judges IV, 11). So does a Jewish tribe found by the missionary Wolf, quoted by Andree, *Zur Volkskunde der Juden*, p. 226f., in the mountains near Hedjaz, observing the Mosaic law, claim to be descendants of Jethro (comp. Num. X, 28; Judges IV, 11). Of especial significance is also the story of Zosimus, a Christian apocryphon of the fifth or sixth century (see James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, Cambridge, 1893, p. 94f., 101-3), containing a description of the life of the sons of Jonadab the Rechabite which has a decided Essene character. 'They abstain from sexual intercourse after they have brought to life two children.'

The identification of Jabez with Othniel the son of Kenaz is found also in the patristic literature where Kenaz is said to have been 'a prophet who lived in the land of Saar (?) and was buried in the cave of the Kenazite who was a Judge in the days of Anarchy' (comp. Judges XXI, 25). The prophecy of Kenaz has been the subject of an apocryphon regarded by James (l. c., 476-79) as originally Jewish. Both Jonadab and Jabez are counted among the persons who, like Enoch and Elijah, entered Paradise alive (Derek Erez Suta I, ed. Tawrogi, p. 8). Jabez as contemporary of Jeremiah is mentioned in Syr. Apoc. Baruch 5, 5.

⁴ Joseph Schwarz (l. c., 290-3), while finding Essene traditions preserved in the Zohar, calls attention to Zohar III, 83, where the highest attributes are assigned to Moses as King, the verse Deut. XXXIII, 5 *יְהוָה בִּישׁוּרוֹן מֶלֶךְ* being, in connection with the preceding verse, referred to Moses: 'And he (Moses) became king in Jeshurun'—an interpretation found also in the Targ. Y. and the *Lekah Tob*, but not accepted in *Sifre* or elsewhere. That the name of Moses was invoked in an oath in Palestine is shown by its frequent use by R. Haggai (Yer. Demay, IV, 26a; Yoma, I, 38c; Meg. I, 72a; Ta'an. IV, 67b; Nazir 54a; Sanh. II, 19d; Hor. III, 47d), and the former Palestinian R. Safrā (Shab. 101b; Beza, 38b; Suk. 39a; Hull. 93a), and the custom was kept up in Yemen in Maimonides' time (Sefer Hamizwot, I, 7). This may have led the Essenes, as far as they claimed special relationship to Moses either as Rechabites (Kenites) or as Sons of Moses, (which may have originally simply signified, 'disciples of Moses'), to punish any abuse of the name of Moses with death. Of this great veneration of Moses, which comes near an apotheosis, traces are found in the *Assumptio Mosis* which presents him as a Mediator prepared from the foundation of the world (comp. *מְסִיחָא* in Pes. R. 6; Exod. R. III, 6; VI, 3; Deut. R. III, 13; I, 14; III, 12; comp. XI, 16).

⁵ The story of the fallen angels, the *נְפִילִים* (comp. Pirk. d. R. E. XXII,

שנפלו מן השמים) with their two rebel chiefs Azazel, עוזאל (comp. Brandt, D. Mand. Rel. 198 and Norberg's Onomasticon) and Semiaza, שמחזאי (the full name שמאי אחזאי 'the seizer or assailant of heaven' like Etanim or Titans); see Sayce, Babylonian Literature, p. 32, and comp. Angra Mainyu in Bundahish, III, 26, Stave, Parsismus im Judenth., p. 176, note, is found also and with characteristic additions in Mid. Abkir, see Yalk. Bereshit, 44, Jellinek, B. H. IV, 127f. There Shamahazai in punishment of his seduction of the daughters of men and his instruction of them in the magic use of the ineffable Name is cast down to be henceforth *suspended* between heaven and earth. Both the Biblical story of the sexual union of the sons of God and the daughters of men and of Enoch's supreme station among the angels, ויחלך חנוך את אלהים, was given a different interpretation by the rabbis (Exod. R. XXV, 1; comp. also Bezold, Die Schatzhöhle, 14ff. and the Ethiopic Book of Adam and Eve, transl. by Malan, chaps. 30ff., p. 137f.). Enoch was degraded in the estimate of the rabbis, and later on also of the Church fathers, whereas the mystics and Cabbalists retained the views of the apocalyptists and created the celestial figure Henoch-Metatron, that is the heavenly charioteer of the Merkabah such as Mithras in the Persian mythology was (see besides Kohut, Angelolog., p. 36f., and Aruk, Windischmann, Zoroastr. Stud., 309ff., and J. E., VIII, 500, art. 'Merkabah').

DOSITHEUS, THE SAMARITAN HERESIARCH, AND HIS RELATIONS TO JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES AND SECTS

Reprinted from the American Journal of Theology, vol. XV, 3 (July, 1911), pp. 404-435.

* This article had been finished several weeks before the letter of E. N. Adler in the London Athenaeum of February 4 came to the notice of the writer, affording him great satisfaction to find a number of points brought out that accord with the results of his own study, particularly the attribution of the document to Simeon ben Shetaḥ and to Pompey.

² See Harkavy's article in Graetz, Gesch. d. J., V³, 413ff.

³ See Abul-Fatḥ—37; Heidenheim's Sam. Bibl., passim, and JQR., VIII, 572.

⁴ Ps. CX; Targ. Yer. Deut. XXXIII, 10, and in the Testament of Levi.

⁵ Jer. Sanh., VI, 4, p. 23b.

⁶ Cf. Ephes. 2, 14.

⁷ Deut. XXXII, 33.

⁸ II; VIII; XVII; see Ryle and James' Introduction, xlff.

⁹ See Josephus, Ant., XVIII, 4, 1; Schürer, G.V.I., I³, 358; II, 151.

¹⁰ Cf. Contra Celsum, I, 57; Philo de Monarchia, 9; Gfroerer, Jahrb. d. Heils, I, 2, 324-42; Josephus, Ant., XX, 5, 1; 8; 6.

¹¹ Merx, Der Messias or Ta'eb der Samaritaner, 42.

¹² Ant., IV, 6, 4-6.

¹³ Vita Mosis, I, 52-53.

¹⁴ Cf. Sanhedrin 92b; 97b; 'Abod. Zarah 9ab; Luke 17, 20: *Μετὰ παραρῆσεως*; Heidenheim, Bibl. Samarit., III, Introd., xxix.

¹⁵ Ketub. 112a; W. B. Levy, s. v. Sod; cf. Ezek. XIII, 9; Samarit. Chronicle at the close.

¹⁶ R. Hash. 31a; Tamid 6, 4; Assumptio Mosis 10, 12; Testam. Levi, chap. 17; Slavonic Enoch, chaps. 32, 33; cf. Roensch, B. d. Jubileen, 385; Merx, op. cit., 23; Bousset, Relig. d. Judenth., II, 282f.

¹⁷ Isa. XI, 4; Targum, cf. Bousset, op. cit., 588f.; III Sibyl, 63; see Belial and Eschatology, J.E., II, 659; IV, 212.

¹⁸ Cf. Luke 10, 17; Didache 16, 3.

¹⁹ Ket. 112a; Yer. R. H. II, 58b; Sanh. I, 18c.

²⁰ See Merx, op. cit.

²¹ Dibre Kabbalah; see W. B. Levy, s. v. Kabbalah.

²² See Josephus, Ant., XII, 10, 5-6; Epiphanius Haeres., i, 14.

²³ P. 258, Haarbr. transl.

²⁴ See Montgomery, The Samaritans, 253ff.; Kirchheim, Karme Shomron, 25f.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth., I, 65f.; Herzfeld, G.V.I., II, 600, and Schechter's Introduction. We are told that the 'Dositheans had a different mode of reckoning the period of purification.' In regard to this difference between the Samaritans and the Pharisees see Nidda, 66a, 33a, and later on: "They declared the fountain into which dead vermin had fallen to be impure." This also is found to be Samaritan; see Mas. Kuthim (ed. Kirchheim), I, 33, n. 6; that 'he upon whom the shadow of a grave has fallen is unclean for seven days.' This should read: 'he who had come beneath the shadow, that is, beneath the roof of the projecting enclosure of a grave, is unclean in accordance with Num. XIX, 14'; see Sifre, ad loc.: they 'forbade the eating of eggs of fowl as unfit for sacrifice.' This is, as Schechter has shown, similar to a statute given in our Document: "They rejected the formula: 'Blessed be our God forever!' " This probably refers to the Pharisaic formula: "Blessed be our God from one world to the other," which was to accentuate the belief in resurrection, which the Samaritans denied (see Jost, G. d. J., I, 65f., and Berak. IX, 4): "They did not pronounce the Tetragram but used Elohim instead." This also is Samaritan; see farther on: "They counted Pentecost from the day after Passover, as do the Jews." This is scarcely a correct statement. See farther on: "They taught that a priest might enter an infected house, as long as he did not speak forth." It is also rabbinic Halakah that the house becomes unclean only by the priest's express declaration (Neg'aim XII, 5): "That the question whether the tenement adjoining the impure house is also unclean should be decided by watching whether a clean or unclean bird first alights upon the former." For this strange statement see Kirchheim, op. cit., 26. "On Sabbath they ate and drank only from earthen vessels, not from those of metal." The reason for this statute is that the latter might be, when unclean, purified on Sabbath, which is forbidden, whereas clay vessels cannot be purified. "They insisted on providing food and

water for the cattle on the day before the Sabbath, forbidding to do so on the Sabbath day." This also is Samaritan law. "In the code of their prophet it was stated that God was worshiped in the land of *Havilah* (the text has *Sueilah*) until Mount Gerizim took its place." This seems to be intended to contradict the statement of the Book of Jubilees (4, 25-26) and the Book of Adam that the Mount of the east side of Eden (*har ha-Kedem*) as the place of worship for the Protoplastes was afterward substituted by Mount Zion. A book containing the history of the leaders of men (Imams) since Adam is ascribed to him by Abul-Fatḥ as well as by Eulogius. This is probably the Zadokite genealogy.

²⁵ Introd., xxiv, n. 52.

²⁶ Chronique Samaritaine, ed. Neubauer, 58.

²⁷ Cf. Heidenheim, Vierteljahrschr., IV, 369.

²⁸ See art. Dosethai in J.E., IV, 643.

²⁹ See Ewald, G.V.I., VII, 221, n. 3, and cf. Hilgenfeld, op. cit., 137, 428, 433.

³⁰ See Eusebius, Church History, I, 7, 14.

³¹ See Montgomery, 255-59.

³² See Pesik. 49; Pesik. Rab. xv.

³³ See Cowley in JQR., VIII, 572.

³⁴ As to the meaning of *Hagah* see Sanhed. 10, 1 and W. B. Levy, s.v. Ordinary Samaritan Pentateuch scrolls often had *Shema*, שמע ('the name') written in place of the Tetragram (see Heidenheim, Bibliot. Samarit., III, 182). According to Tosefta Sanhedrin IV, 7, the king's Torah scroll was not to be used by anyone else but was subject to revision by the three judicial courts, that of the priests, the Levites, and the common Israelites.

³⁵ Cf., however, the rabbinical interpretation of Gen. XXIV, 1 in B. Mez., 87a.

³⁶ P. 13. Cf. Yoma, 26a, and art. Levi in J.E.

³⁷ *Bakker* occurs in the Bible only as a verb signifying 'to examine,' particularly for the shepherd, and also for the priest or sage. Accordingly *Mebakker* is the examiner or overseer—*Episcopus* in the sense of the rabbinical *Parnas* from *προνοήσκειν*, "caretaker." In earlier times the affairs of the community were in charge of the *Amarkol* or *Catholicus*. See Schürer, II³, 271.

³⁸ Cf. for the plagues the rabbinical law concerning the *hakam* (Sifra Tazri'a I; Bekorot IV, 3-5).

³⁹ Cf. Mekilta Yithro, at the close.

⁴⁰ P. 12. Cf. Exod. XIX, 15; Deut. XXIII, 15; I Sam. XXI, 5-6.

⁴¹ The term *bet ha-Hishtahavot*, 'the house of prostration,' whence the Syriac *Be Masgedo*, the Arabic Masged, formed after Zech. XIV, 16-17, is decidedly Jewish; see Midrash to I Sam. I, 3. So is the term *serek*, 'order,' which, as Professor Margolis of Dropsie College has pointed out to the writer, is found twice in the Hebrew Testament of Levi, JQR., XIX, 574, where the Greek has *τάξις*.

⁴² See Schechter, liv, n. 15.

⁴³ Josephus, B.J., II, 8, 7-10.

⁴⁴ Nachgel, Schr., III, 261; Urschrift, 266.

⁴⁵ Cf. Lev. XXIV, 11, 16; Urschr., 273f.

⁴⁶ Sheb. 38b f.

⁴⁷ Schechter refers to I Sam. XXV, 26, 31, 33; but it is probably a quotation from some lost apocryphal work; cf. Tosefta, B.K., X, 38; but altogether foreign to rabbinical law, B.K., 27b.

⁴⁸ See Kohut Aruk s.v.; scarcely *Eben ha-To'im*, "Stone of the Erring."

⁴⁹ Cf. Sifre and M.K. 16ab.

⁵⁰ Num. V, 2-3; Sifre; Deut. XXIII, 15; Kel., I, 7; Tos. Kel., I, 13. Targ. Y. to Exod. XVIII, 8 and cf. Josephus, J.W., I, 8, 8, regarding the Essene practice.

⁵¹ Mekilta and Gittin 88b; also from Ps. CXLVIII, 19, Tanh. Shofetim.

⁵² See Bernays, Ges., Abh. 1, 182f., and cf. the thirty Noahidic Commandments (Hul. 92a) and Jew. Q. R., VI, 259.

⁵³ G.V.I., VII, 139.

⁵⁴ Koran Sura, XX, 97; cf. Albiruni, tr. Sachau, 25, 374; Targ. Yer. to Exod. XXXII, 5.

⁵⁵ Tos., Pesah I, 15; Hul. 4a.

⁵⁶ *Mar'il* from *ra'al*, 'to envelop,' p. 10, l. 11, is correct and a better term than *Matbil* suggested by Schechter. For *shemo* (p. 12, l. 16), read *besaro*.

⁵⁷ See Erub. 14ab; Tos. Nega'im VI, 2; Sifre to Num. XIX, 14; Yadayim IV, 7; cf. Tos. Yoma I, 12; IV, 20.

⁵⁸ Nid. IV, 1-2; cf. Munagga in Wreschner's Sam. Traditionen, 30ff.; Geiger, He Haluz, V, 29; VI, 28; W. Ztschr., I, 51; II, 27; Nachgel., Schr., III, 315f.; Schorr, He Haluz, VIII, 51.

⁵⁹ See Sifra Mezor'a at the close; Shab. 64b.

⁶⁰ III, 9-14; see Charles' notes and Beer, op. cit., 40.

⁶¹ See Hul. 6a; Nid. 33a; Kirchheim, K. Schomron, 21ff., and Mas. Kuthim.

⁶² Cf. Philo, ed. Mangey, I, 239, 240, and elsewhere.

⁶³ Sifra Emor, VII, 98a; cf. 99a; Tem. 2; cf. 7a; Men. 73b; Hul. 13b; cf. 5a.

⁶⁴ Sifra Wayikra II, 4c; cf. M.K. 15b.

⁶⁵ Berak. 20b; 22b.

⁶⁶ The word *welo* of the line below belongs here.

⁶⁷ A term for Satan found only in the pre-Talmudic literature, corresponding with the rabbinical *Ruah ha-Tumah*, 'spirit of impurity,' as all idolatry is contaminating; see Sanh. 65b; Shab. IX, 1; Tos. Zabim V, 6.

⁶⁸ Deut. XVIII, 10; Sanh. loc. cit.

⁶⁹ See art. Kiddush ha Shem in the J.E.

⁷⁰ Cf. Lev. XXV, 46; Sifre to Deut. XXIII, 16; Gittin, IV, 6.

⁷¹ See his Lesestücke aus der Mishnah, 91.

⁷² Mek. to. Exod. XXXV, 1; Shab. 70a.

⁷³ Jer. XVIII, 21f.; Neh. X, 32; XIV, 15; cf. Amos VIII, 5.

⁷⁴ See Maim., H. Shab., XXIII, 12; XXI, 9.

⁷⁵ Yeb. 90b; Sanh. 46a.

⁷⁶ Shab. I, 5-8; cf. Tos. Shab. I, 21; and see Geiger, Nachgel. Schr., III, 288; He Ḥaluz vi, 15-19.

⁷⁷ Isa. LVIII, 13; Shab. 118ab.

⁷⁸ Mek. Ki Tissa; Yoma 85b; cf. Mark 2, 27: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath."

^{78a} See Schürer, II, 414, 491f.

⁷⁹ Schürer, III⁴, 166.

⁸⁰ Cf. He Ḥaluz, VI, 30ff.

⁸¹ Jub. 2, 29f.; 1, 8-13.

⁸² *Teezaza Sanbat.*, tr. by Halévy, Paris, 1902.

⁸³ Halévy, 142, seemingly misunderstood the words; but cf. 'Essenes,' J.E., V, 229, col. ii.

⁸⁴ Cf. Shab. 32b; Nedar. 20a.

⁸⁵ Yer. Ḥag. I, 76c; cf. Bereshit R. 60, 4.

⁸⁶ Josephus, B.J., I, 52; cf. art. in J.E.

⁸⁷ The rest of the defective text I would translate as follows: "As regards vow-offerings no one shall vow unto the altar a thing obtained by force. Nor shall the priests take anything from Israel by mere force. Neither shall a man devote the food which belongs to a Gentile [read *legoy*] for this is what He said: They capture each other by a ban" [*herem* is taken in the sense of ban in Micah VII, 2].

⁸⁸ Mas. Kuthim, ed. Kirchheim, 33-34.

⁸⁹ Wreschner, op. cit., 51.

⁹⁰ The text (p. 4, l. 19) reads: "The builders of the hollow partition wall (Separatists) who walk after empty talk." Zav in Hos. V, 11 means emitting sounds; cf. Mic. XII, 6, 11; see also Cheney in Haupt's Bible, p. 153, on *Zav le-Zav*.

⁹¹ Peterman, Reisen im Orient, I, 279.

⁹² See Abot d. R., Nathan ed., Schechter 5a; Sifre and Tanḥ. to Deut. XXI, 5; Pesik. R. XLIII; Beresh. R. XXIII, 3.

^{93a} Lekah Tob to Deut. XXI, 5, to which Schechter refers.

⁹³ Didascalia ii, 2, 2; I Tim. 3, 12; and Canones Jacobs von Edessa, ed. Kayser, 160-62.

⁹⁴ See Harkavy's Lik. Kadm., 97, 100; Hadassi, 117c, and Graetz, Gesch., V³, 449.

⁹⁵ Gesammelte Schriften, II, 303.

⁹⁶ Polem. Lit., 398.

⁹⁷ See Poznanski in the Kaufmann Gedenkbuch, 173.

⁹⁸ Didascalia, ed. Funk, 568. So also the Syrian church. See Kayser's Canones Jacobs von Edessa, loc. cit.

⁹⁹ See 4, 15-33; 8, 5, 6; 9, 7.

¹⁰⁰ Yebam 62b; Sanh. 76b; Beresh. R. XVIII, 5; cf. JQR., V, 406, note.

¹⁰¹ The passage strangely interrupts the context and seems to be a marginal note suggested by the term *Malak Mastema*, for Satan, found exclusively in the Book of Jubilees for Satan. Speaking of the readmission of the penitent (proselyte?) 'who returns to the Law of Moses,'

the Document continues: "And on the day on which the man sincerely returns to the Law of Moses, 'the angel of hostility' will turn away from him, if he shall but fulfil his promise. For this reason was Abraham circumcised on the day he learned of it"—that is of the Law of the Covenant (Jubil. 15, 26-34). Here the marginal note reads: "For this is stated clearly . . . in the Book of the Divisions of the Seasons according to Their Jubilees and Their Weeks."

¹⁰² See the instructive notes of Charles to Jubilees 6, 29-36.

¹⁰³ Cf. Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch*, 421f.

¹⁰⁴ See Berthelot, Dillmann-Ryssel, and Driver.

¹⁰⁵ Originally the seven harvest weeks were not all, or only loosely, connected with the Passover, or Mazzot festival (see Deut. XV, 9 and cf. Josh. V, 11). There are also indications in Scripture (see I Sam. XX, 5, 18ff.) that the month consisted originally in the pre-exilic time of four weeks with the seventh day as the Sabbath and two days celebrated as new moon festivals, so that practically each new moon and each full moon began on the first day of the week. A dim remembrance of this fact may underlie the tradition of the Sadducees and Samaritans as well as the calendar system of the Book of Jubilees. (Cf. Hitzig, *Ostern u. Pfingsten*, 4f., where attention is called to the Pentecost festival mentioned by Josephus [Ant., XIII, 8, 4] as having been celebrated in the time of John Hyrcanus on the day after Sabbath.) However, the Septuagint translates Lev. XXIII, 11, 'the morrow of the first day,' in accordance with the Pharisean doctrine. So also Josephus (Ant., III, 10, 5) and Philo (*De Septennario*, 20); neither of them knows of the Feast of Weeks being celebrated as the Memorial Day of the Giving of the Law (Exod. XIX, 1f.) as found in the Synagogue liturgy which must have been known to the author of the Book of Jubilees 1, 1; 6, 17; 15, 1 (see Charles' notes), as well as to the Therapeutae (see art. in J.E., XII, 139) and to the early Christians (see Spitta, *Apostelgesch.*, 27, to Acts 2, 1ff.).

¹⁰⁶ See Charles' note on Jub. 1, 1.

¹⁰⁷ Shab. 86b, where a difference of opinion between R. Jose and others is expressed.

¹⁰⁸ See Ratner, *Mabo le Sed. s. Olam*. 109, and Pirke d. R. Eliezer, chap. 8.

¹⁰⁹ See Jellinek *Beth ha Midrash*, iii.

¹¹⁰ Ratner 110, and JQR., II, 190.

¹¹¹ From the Halakik point of view Ben Sira had as little right to be placed among the Ketubim ('the holy writings') in the Baraita quoted Baba Kamma 92b, as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs had in Sifre Num. XII; Sota 7b, where, notwithstanding Schechter's emendation (Introd., xxvii, n. 65), the passage must have well-known written 'words of the Agadah' in view. See Sanh. 100b; Yer. Sanh. X, 28b; Koh. R. XII, 13, and cf. Joel, Blicke in d. Religionsgesch., I, 68-76, where it is shown that the words 'external books' refer to works of heretics and not to non-canonical or pseudepigraphical works. The entire apocalyptic literature also of the rabbis consists of pseudepigrapha.

¹¹² Ed. Schechter, 26.

¹¹³ Quoted in Geiger's *Urschrift*, 106, note.

¹¹⁴ See Harkavy in Graetz. *Gesch.*, V³, 413ff.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Heb. 8, 8-12.

¹¹⁶ See Eusebius, H.E., I, 7, 14.

¹¹⁷ See Weizsacker, *Apostol. Zeitalter*, 1.

¹¹⁸ Eusebius, H.E., I, 7, 14; III, 20.

¹¹⁹ Haeres., xxix, 7; xxx, 2.

¹²⁰ According to Epiphanius, Haeres., xxx, 2, the Ebionites observed the Levitical purity laws as strictly as did the Samaritans and, as we have seen, the Dositheans. They, however, rejected sacrificial worship (Epiphanius, xxx, 16), which, strange to say, was retained by some oriental churches, the Syrian, Armenian, and Abyssinian, down to modern times (see Kayser, *op. cit.*, 171; Petermann, *op. cit.*, I, 227; Prot. R. E. *Syrische Kirche*, XIX, 302; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, X, 617), and this cannot be due to Jewish influence, as has been asserted.

¹²¹ There are several villages by that name in northern Palestine; one near Beth Shemesh has the name of Kaukab el Hama ('Star of the Sun'). See Schwarz, *D. heilige Land*, 133; Neubauer, *La géographie du Talmud*, 269; Noeldeke, *Z.D.M.G.*, 1868, 521, who mentions two villages Kaukab in Galilee; cf. *Land Anecdota Syr.*, I, 106, 191; Zahn, *Forschungen*, II, 333f.

¹²² See article Bar Kokba in J.E.

¹²³ For the latter name see p. 20, l. 15, where it refers to Simeon ben Shetah.

THE HALAKIK PORTIONS IN JOSEPHUS' ANTIQUITIES (IV, 8, 5-43)

A paper read before the Jewish Theological Society of Cincinnati, March, 1916, printed in "*Hebrew Union College Monthly*," Feb. 1917.

¹ Josephus.

² Philo u. d. Halakah.

³ Josephus u. d. Halakah.

⁴ Das Strafgerichtsverfahren bei Josephus.

THE SABBATH AND FESTIVALS IN PRE-EXILIC AND EXILIC TIMES

Reprinted from the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. XXXVII (1917), pp. 209-223.

¹ See Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 67-69, especially p. 68; Schrader-Zimmern, *KAT.* p. 402f., 514f.; Alfred Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, p. 43, 357, note 3.

THE TETRAGRAMMATON (SHEM HAM-M'FORASH) AND ITS USES

Reprinted from the Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy (October, 1920), pp. 20-32.

¹ See Sota 38a; Sanh. 56a; 60ab; Sifra Lev. XXIV, 19 where שם (לי), שם המפורש occurs, signifying the distinct or peculiar Name, whereas פרישם, which originally like the Pharisaic name פרישם and hence פרושים = the Separatists, was used in the Aramaic sense and afterwards in the sense of the Hebrew פרוש = pronounce like נוקב Lev. XXIV, 19 (see Pes. d. R. K. 148a, Targ. and Sifra Lev. XXIV, 11; comp. also Gen. R. XCVIII, 4 פירש בשפתיו). Comp. Blau D. altjued. Zauberswesen p. 120-124 and 128 note 1, where the Bibliography is given; also C. Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers p. 56 note, where Wisdom XIV, 20 = the incommunicable Name is referred to.

² See especially Kittel's luminous art. on Jahveh, Jehovah in Herzog-Hauck's Realencycl., where the best bibliography is given on the subject.

³ Comp., 'the secret Name which is not to be pronounced among men,' in Dietrich's Abraxas p. 195.

⁴ Comp. Wellhausen, Isr. u. Jued. Gesch. p. 213.

⁵ See especially Smend Alttest. Religionsgesch. 17-18f, and John P. Peters, Religion of the Hebrews p. 81ff.

⁶ Ber. 9a.

⁷ Comp. Wellhausen l. c. 26 note.

⁸ See Wellhausen, Reste Arab. Heidenth. 213; Usener, Goetternamen 335. Comp. for this whole investigation HeitmueLLer's elucidating work, Im Namen Jesu, Goettingen 1903. The work of the learned, yet eccentric, Dr. Jacob of Goettingen, Im Namen Gottes is too apologetic to be of much use.

⁹ The verb מוכיר is like מוכיר לבנה (Isai. LXVI, 3), a verbum denominativum derived from מוכרה which, in fact, is not a memorial sacrifice, as it is usually translated after LXX, nor a fragrant sacrifice, as Ewald, Hupfeld, Dillmann, and others explain the word, but an incense offering in the shape of a pointed flame, the ancient priestly term being derived from זכר the male organ i. e. the pointed end (comp. the Assyrian *Askaru* for the moon sickle and the Talmudic זכריות = the head or spring-point of the Jordan and Euphrates (Bek. 55a). As Ewald, D. Alterth. d. V. I. p. 62 note, with especial reference to Lev. XXIV, 7, has shown, the *Askarah* is only an incense offering connected with the *Minhah*, the meal offering, which does not raise a pillar of smoke as does the fat and flesh of the meat-offering. The pointed flame of the incense is obviously to take the place of the pillar of smoke of the meat offering.

¹⁰ See L. Loew, Ges. Schriften I, 187-212, "Die Aussprache des vierbuchstabigen Gottesnamens."

¹¹ About the Name of 12, of 42, and of 72 letters, see especially Midrash Lekah Tob to Ex. III, 14-15 and XIV, 21 and Buber's notes p. 19

and 88. Later on the name *Adonai*, too, was avoided and in its stead such terms came into use as *המקום, השמים, הקדוש ב"ה, הגבורה*, also *רחמנו* in the Talmud, and, still later *יהוה*.

¹² Stress is laid on the expression *לידעיק* in Ps. XXXVI, 11 and *ידע* *כי שמי* in Ps. XCI, 14, corresponding with *ידע עמי שמי* in Isai. LII, 6. How far back the belief in the magic power of the Name and its use by God himself goes may be learned from Enoch LXIX, 13–25. There we read that "God had placed in the hand of the archangel Michael the hidden Name by the power of whose oath, named in v. 13 Biqua and in v. 15 Akae (certainly a mysterious word (תנא) which stands for JHVH), the heavens, the earth and the sea, sun, moon and stars were fixed and the paths of the winds, the chambers of the rain and dew, the hail and hoarfrost and all the hosts of the spirits were established." Comp. Prayer of Manasseh, 3 and Suk. 53ab.

Comp. Ber. 6a where God himself is spoken of as wearing *Tefillin*, just as Israel, according to Eliezer ben Hyrcanos at the end of the first century, wears them in order that 'the nations may see the Great Name upon thee and fear thee.' (Deut. XXVIII, 10.)

*SHEMA YISRAEL—ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF ITS DAILY RECITAL

Reprinted from the Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy, vol. I, 3 (October, 1919), pp. 255–264.

¹ Cf. Ibn Ezra to Gen. II, 9: *we-'Eltz hada'at tob we'ra*, where da'ath is to be supplied.

² Steinthal, Ueber Juden u. Judenthum, 255.

³ Gottesdienstl. Vortraege, 379².

⁴ See Targ. to I Sam. IX, 13. Rosh Hashanah 29b; Levy Targ. W. B. S. V. פירס; comp. also the term *Nesiat Kappayim* for the Priest's Bless.; comp. Ps. CXXXIV, 2: *שאו ידיכם קדש וברכו את ה'*.

⁵ See Spiegel, Avesta II, XLIX; LI; III 7; 10; 2–7, and Eranisches Alterthum III, 691; comp. my article l. c. and Graetz Gesch. der Juden II p. 419.

*THE PSALMS AND THEIR PLACE IN THE LITURGY

Paper read before the Gratz College, Philadelphia, 1897

¹ The malady-stricken prays like Naaman, the Syrian general:

"Let thy divine majesty cleanse the disease of thy servant in the river!"

² He had eaten food consecrated to the deity, which is tabooed (cursed).

³ The Book of Enoch ascribes the art of playing these instruments to the fallen angels under the leadership of Azazel and Shemhazai, who taught it to the daughters of men to seduce them to sin.

DIE BIBEL UND DIE TODESSTRAFE

Published as a booklet in Leipzig, 1868.

¹ Vgl. Genes. IV, 10, Hiob XVI, 18, Ezech. XXIV, 7-8, Jes. XXVI, 21 u. Schultens Excerpt. Hamasae 416 u. 466, Burkhardt's Beduinen 119 u. 251.

² Wachsmuth hellen. Alterthumsk. III, 141-184, Tacit. Germania 12 u. 21, Tobien d. Blutrache nach russ. Recht.

³ Robinson Palestina I. 233. Lane, Sitten und Gebräuche I. 106, 212. Tacit. Germ. 21 u. vgl. Numeri XXXV, 31.

⁴ Von solchen dienstthuenden Frauen im Tempel ist die Rede Exod. XXXVIII, 8 u. I. Sam. II, 22. Zu den Netinim vgl. d. Art. in Winer R. W. B., I. Chron. IX, 2 u. vgl. Num. VIII, 16, wo die Leviten selbst solche Gotthingegebenen an Stelle der Gott heiligen israelitischen Erstgeburt genannt werden.

⁵ Durch das Loos wurde z. B. oft über Schuld und Unschuld einer Person entschieden (vgl. Jos. VII, 14, I. Sam. XIV, 42) und ein altes Volksspruchwort sagt (Proverb. XVI, 38): "In den Schooss wirft man das Loos, aber von Jahwe kommt das Urtheil." Eine Art Gottesurtheil, wie wir solche bei den Deutschen und vielen Völkern finden, die Keuschheitsprobe durch das Fluchwasser, das man einer des Ehebruchs verdächtigen Frau zu trinken gab, um ihre Schuld daran zu erkennen, wenn ihr Leib und Hüfte aufschwollen, ist ein solcher Rest superstitiöser Bräuche, der auch im Gesetz (Numer. V, 14) Aufnahme gefunden.

II

THE MISSION OF ISRAEL AND ITS APPLICATION
TO MODERN TIMES

Reprinted from Year Book, vol. XXIX, Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1919.

משלח in the second part of the verse is a corruption of משלח.

² Comp. the קהל גרים in Sifre Deut., 247.

³ Shab. 88b; Ex. R. V, 9; Tanh. Shemot (ed. Buber); Acts II, 6.

⁴ Sifre Deut. XXXIII, 2; Joshua VIII, 32; Sota 32; Deut. XXVII, 8 and Targum Y.

⁵ See Kuenen, Prophets and Prophecy, 373, 457 and Kohler, Jewish Theology, 337.

⁶ See Yeb. 24b; Niv. 566; Yer. Kid. IV, 65b with reference to the גרי שלחן מלכים and גרי אריות.

⁷ See Geiger Wiss. Zeitsch. 1868, 18 and Union Prayer Book II, 332 and compare with the suggestive chapter, The Mission of Israel in Claude G. Montefiore's Outlines of Liberal Judaism, p. 156-170.

⁸ See my Jewish Theology with reference to Pes. R. 144b and Mid. Teh. Ps. XXXVI, 6.

BACKWARDS OR FORWARDS

A series of discourses on Reform Judaism delivered before the Beth-El congregation, New York, 1885, in the course of a controversy with the Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut as champion of orthodoxy; the latter's discourses were reprinted in his "The Ethics of the Fathers" (N. Y., 1920).

THREE DISCOURSES ON JEWISH ETHICS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCES TO THE DECALOGUE

Papers, read before the Fifth Annual Session of the Summer Assembly of the Jewish Chautauqua Society, held at Atlantic City, New Jersey, July 7 to July 28, 1901.

SYNAGOGUE AND CHURCH IN THEIR MUTUAL RELATIONS, PARTICULARLY IN REFERENCE TO THEIR ETHICAL TEACHINGS

Address delivered at the Jewish Denominational Congress of the World's Parliament of Religions at Chicago, August 27, 1893.

HUMAN BROTHERHOOD AS TAUGHT BY THE RELIGIONS BASED ON THE BIBLE

Address delivered before the World's Parliament of Religions in Chicago, September, 1893.

THE HARMONIZATION OF THE JEWISH AND CIVIL LAWS OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

Reprinted from Yearbook, vol. XXV, Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1915.

¹ *Proces Verbal des Seances de l'Assemblée*, etc. (Paris, 1806, pp. 30-36), and *Actes du Grand Sanhedrin* (1807, pp. 92-96).

² February 22, 1910; see *Pub. of Am. Jewish Historical Soc.*, 1911, No. 20, p. 137-146; *Jewish Exponent* 1910, No. 21. Reference must also be made here to the testimony given by Chief Rabbi Adler and Israel Abrahams before the British Commission on Divorce in 1909, as recorded in the *Jewish Chronicle*; also to the article on Jewish Marriages and the English Law, by H. S. G. Henriques, *Jewish Quarterly Review* XX, 391-449; see especially pp. 437-440f (since reprinted in book-form.)

³ The term 'Liberal Judaism,' which some American rabbis have adopted, following the example of leading English and German Jews, implies to my mind a certain vagueness and laxity and fails to accentuate the principle of reform and progress upon the recognition of which, as the vital spirit and motive power of Judaism throughout history, the whole modern movement rests

⁴ See Frankel's Zeitschrift, 1844, p. 275f, and Leopold Loew's Ges. Schriften III, 348.

⁵ See Protocolle der ersten Rabbiner-Conference zu Braunschweig, 63-94; 94-98.

⁶ See Verhandlungen der ersten Israelit. Synode, 1869, p. 246f, 259f, and Verhandlungen der zweiten Synode, 1873, p. 30-49, 76-158. Comp. David Philipson, Reform Movement in Judaism (1st ed.) 435-446.

⁷ See Protocolle der Rabbiner-Conferenz abgeh. zu Philadelphia, 1869, and Philipson l. c., p. 489f.

⁸ See Yearbook 1890-91, p. 41. Compare his standpoint in regard to the *Get* in the Protocol of the Philadelphia Conference (Protocolle, p. 28)

⁹ See Mielziner (l. c., 15-19); Israel Abraham's Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, 153f.

¹⁰ Shabu'ot 30a; Maimuni H. Edut IX, 12-; Josephus Ant. IV, 8-15. Only in regard to her husband's death or to the *Get* she brings along from distant lands is her testimony sufficient to allow her a re-marriage, Yeb. 87b.

¹¹ Sanh. 22b.

¹² Maim. H. Ishut XV, 7. But see Isserlin's gloss to Eben ha Ezer, CLIV, 10, after Mishnah Yebamot V, 16; Babli 64a.

¹³ Berak. III, 3; VII, 2, etc.

¹⁴ Berak. 24a. See article on Bareheadedness, in J. E. Comp. also article on the Covering of the Hair of Married Women, in Geiger's Zeitschrift, 1897, p. 333ff. Also Lippert, Kulturgesch. II, 124f, Westermarck, 173.

¹⁵ See about the three Talmudic benedictions and their parallels: "I thank Thee, O Lord, that Thou hast not made me a barbarian (*Goy*), a slave or a woman," David Kaufmann, Monatschrift, 1893, p. 14-18.

¹⁶ See Clay Trumbull, Threshold Covenant and Blood Covenant, 1885. Curtis, Ursemitische Religion, 234f. Westermarck, History of Human Marriage, 1890, Chapter XIX. Zimmer, Altindisches Leben, p. 311f. Weinhold, Die Deutschen Frauen, 275. Edwards, History and Poetry of Finger rings, 195ff. Lippert, Kulturgesch. II, 144f.

¹⁷ Compare Tobit 8, 4-8; Ketub. 7b; Maim. Ishut III, 24.

¹⁸ The following is the verbal translation:

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the Universe, who hast sanctified us by Thy commandments and hast given us command concerning incestuous marriages and hast forbidden unto us those that are betrothed, but hast allowed us such as are wedded to us by the rite of the Huppah and the Marriage Consecration. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who has sanctified Thy people, Israel, by the rites of the Huppah and the Marriage Consecration.

¹⁹ See especially A History of Matrimonial Institutions, by G. E. Howard, Chapters VI and VII, pp. 258-284; 304; 383.

²⁰ Yoma I, 1; Orah Hayim 581, 1; Isserlin's Gloss.

²¹ Westermarck, History of Human Marriage, 491f. Howard l. c. 234.

²² Yebam. 62b, B. Metziah 59a and elsewhere.

²³ Gittin 90b. Sanh. 23a.

²⁴ Ket. 82b; 10a. The written document ensuring a dowry is probably of Egyptian origin. See Niezold, *Die Ehe in Aegypten*, p. 25ff.

²⁵ Ketub. V, 6; VII 2-5-9-10; Nedarim XI, 12. See Amram, *Jewish Law of Divorce*, p. 54ff.

²⁶ Tosefta Ketub. VII, 6.

²⁷ Eben Ha Ezer CXIX, 6, Isserlin's Gloss. Comp. Rosenthal, in the *Hildesheimer Jubelschrift*, p. 47.

²⁸ Eben Ha Ezer CLIV, 1. Isserlin's Gloss.

²⁹ Comp. Driver's Comm. on Deuteronomy. p. 270.

³⁰ See Maim. H. Gerushin X, 21; Eben Ha Ezer CXIX, 3.

³¹ Gittin IX, 10.

³² Philo Mangey II, 304-313. Josephus, Ant. IV, 8-23.

³³ Matthew 5, 32; 19, 9.

³⁴ Mark 10, 11-12; Luke 16, 18.

³⁵ Maim. H. Gerushin, IV, 12. *Get* is a Babylonian term for document. See Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Woerterbuch s. w. Giltu*.

³⁶ Eben Ha Ezer CXIX, 6 gloss. and see Rosenthal, in the *Hildesheimer Jubelschrift*.

³⁷ Bishop, *Marriage and Divorce*, L, 21, VIII, Ch. 3 and 4, and Census Report of 1909, p. 26f.

³⁸ Sifre, Naso 12.

³⁹ Of course, where the *Get* is recognized by the law of the state, as is the case in Austria, Russia and in all Eastern countries, the same possesses full validity for us, too; but an investigation of the proceedings and the correctness of the *Get* is also requested before re-marriage. See M. J. Kohler's "Invalidity of Rabbinical Divorces Where One or Both of the Parties Reside in the United States" in "Jewish Exponent," March 5, 1926.

⁴⁰ I am informed, however, by my son, Max J. Kohler, that all such cases come, in our American laws, under the head of fraud; that is, *undisclosed* disease, etc., and are annulled by the court.

⁴¹ See Mielziner, 114.

⁴² See Census Report, p. 188.

⁴³ Levit. XVIII, 2-5, 24-30.

⁴⁴ Herodot. III, 31; Spiegel, *Eran* III, 678; Wilkinson, *Hist. of Egypt*, I, 318; and comp. Philo, *De Special Legibus* III, 3.

⁴⁵ See Justinian Code, 1-10 and J. Fulton, *The Laws of Marriage*, p. 31ff, Westermarck l. c. 308. For the whole subject, see M. M. Kalish, *Comm. Leviticus* II, 354-382. Essay on the Matrimonial Laws of the Bible and their Late Development.

⁴⁶ See Anan, *Sefer ha Mizwort* in Harkavy's *Likkute Kadmoniot*, p. 90-109, and compare Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries* XXXVII, with Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften* III, 265, 307f.

⁴⁷ Fulton l. c., p. 65.

⁴⁸ Frankel, in his *Grundlinien*, XIX, goes even so far as to say that the state law which prohibits Jews from marrying their niece, interferes

with their religious conscience, inasmuch as the Jewish authorities regard this marriage as especially meritorious. (See Jebam, 62b; Gen. R. XVIII, 5. Compare also Krauss, *Die Ehe zwischen Onkel und Nichte*, in *Studies in Jewish Literature* (Kohler, *Festschrift*, 165-1 F5). This view, however, can no longer be maintained by us. The Talmudic maxim: *Sekanah adifa me izura* 'Questions of physical danger put the question of ritual law in the background' holds good here. The majority of authorities regard consanguineous marriages as injurious to the offspring. (See Westermarck, 1. c., 340-343 and 345).

⁴⁹ Sifra Ahare 13. איש איש להביא את הנשים שהיו סוהרים על העריות כישראל.

⁵⁰ Sifra 13, 10, אלה הדברים הכתובים בחורה שאלו לא נכתבו בדיון היה לכתוב כגון הגולות והעריות וע"א וקללת השם ושפיכת דמים R. Eleazar b. Azaria's view at the end of Sifra Kedoshin, which is indorsed by Maimonides, *Shemonah Perakim* VI, is different, but this is no reason for correcting our passage in his sense as Leopold Loew, *Eherecht*. Stud., p. 99, note 3, would like to do, as the mention of the incestuous marriages can not have been altogether omitted here.

⁵¹ Laws VIII, ch. 6.

⁵² De Special Legibus III, 3-5.

⁵³ Emunot We Deot III, 2.

⁵⁴ Moreh III, 49.

⁵⁵ Cuzari III, 7, 11.

⁵⁶ Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, Ch. XIV-XVI; Howard, *Matrimonial Institutions*, I, 125ff. (See note 1, p. 359).

⁵⁷ See *Jewish Times* IV, 1872, p. 139; pp. 178-439, *American Israelite* and *Deborah* July 12, 1872.

⁵⁸ The Chinese law also declares the marriage to the deceased brother's wife to be incestuous and to be punished with death by strangling, whereas the marriage to the deceased wife's sister is regarded as especially honorable. (See Westermarck, 1. c. 309). About the Levirate marriage in Jewish law, see also Israel Mattuck in *Studies in Jewish Literature*, (Kohler, *Festschrift*, 210-220).

⁵⁹ Deut. XXV, 5-10.

⁶⁰ Lev. XVIII, 16 and XX, 21.

⁶¹ Yer. Yebamot L, 6.

⁶² Tos. Yebam. VI, 9.

⁶³ Bekorot I, 7.

⁶⁴ Yeb. 39b.

⁶⁵ See Loew, 1. c. 74-78.

⁶⁶ See especially the noteworthy paper by Hartogensis in the *Yearbook of the Charlevoix convention C.C.A.R.* (Vol. XX, p. 128-132).

⁶⁷ Eben Ha Ezer CLIV, 1, Isserlin's Gloss 7. See especially *Nedarim* XI, 12.

⁶⁸ Dr. Lauterbach calls my attention to Yeb. XIV, 1, where a woman's sign giving (*Remizah*) is recognized. Still, she is not treated there as a perfectly normal person either.

⁶⁹ The statement in Friedlander's *The Jewish Religion*, quoted

above, that the offspring of mixed marriages is, from the view-point of the Jewish law, 'illegitimate,' is *not* correct. As a matter of fact, mixed marriages come into the category of those marriages of which either of the party lacks the capacity of contracting a marriage אין קידושין קופסין and where, accordingly, the child follows the status of the mother. (See Kiddushin III, 12, and Yebamot 45b according to Rab, the Halakah being that the child of a non-Jewish father and a Jewish mother is a legitimate Jewish child (Eben Ha Ezer IV, 19.) The opinions in the Talmud, however, differ as to whether the offspring is *Mamzer* or not (see Geiger's Urschrift p. 54 and 351). And so there is among the ancient Tannaim already a wide difference as to the meaning and extent of the character of *Mamzer* (bastard) of whom the Deuteronomic law XXIII, 2, says: "A bastard may not enter the congregation of the Lord, not even to the tenth generation." The word, which only occurs again in Zech. IX, 6, in connection with the Philistines, is obscure as to its etymology and meaning. The Septuagint and Vulgate take it as denoting one born in harlotry. And this is the opinion of R. Akiba, Yeb. 45a; Kidd. 75b; and Yer. Yebam. IV, 15 and Kidd. III, 12. Comp. Sifre Deut. 248, whereas R. Simeon ha Temani and R. Joshua b. Hananiah declare *Mamzer* to be the offspring of such incestuous marriages as are either under the penalty of *Karet* or of death by the court, and their opinion became the accepted Halakah, according to which children born of adultery or of the prohibited degree are bastards, but not those born out of wedlock. That the former class of children must suffer for the sin of their parents seems to be quite in order, as we cannot help looking upon them as if they were lepers for whom we feel pity, but must keep from leading the race to degeneracy and corruption.

Quite different is our attitude to children born of marriages not regarded as incestuous by our State laws and consummated according to civil law. Here we cannot afford to apply the rigid measure of the Jewish law and exclude the innocent children from marrying into ordinary Jewish families. As a matter of fact, the rabbis themselves felt the need of a revision or of practical modification of the entire law regarding the *Mamzer*, when they looked for methods of rehabilitating the family of the *Mamzer* by having him marry a slave, the son of whom could be made a freeman and then marry a Jewess (Kidd. 69a; comp. 71a). We can see a moral taint in marriages that are against nature and the order of life and cannot help looking with some feeling of shudder and revolt against the unfortunate offspring of such, but we cannot see any moral taint in children born of marriages that are not condemned by common consensus as abomination.

ISRAEL'S SOLIDARITY, AMERICAN REFORM JUDAISM, AND THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

Reprinted from the Union Bulletin, vol. XII, 6-7 (June-July, 1922).

THE FAITH OF REFORM JUDAISM

Reprinted from the Menorah Journal, vol. II, 1 (February, 1916), pp. 8-15.

THE KADDISH: ITS ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE

Sermon delivered before the Beth-El congregation, New York, 1892.

¹ Cf. Sabbath 119b. This is no less an authority in Essene mysteries than the famous hero of the Jewish 'Divina Comedia,' as he was called, Rabbi Joshua ben Levi, who fought successfully with the angel of death, and described his journey through hell and Paradise in the treatises ascribed to him under these names. It is interesting to notice that Joshua ben Levi had two great predecessors in Moses and in Abraham. About the latter see our sermon. About the former, compare Jellinek Bet Hamedrash II. Introduction, and other Midrashim. More concerning all this in a work soon to be published, in which the Jewish and Christian literature on the subject will be given with the original sources. A prayer for the dead is already mentioned in II. Maccabee, 12, 43-45, as offered by the 'saintly' Judas Maccabee.

PHILO, ODER JUDENTHUM UND GRIECHISCHE PHILOSOPHIE

A Sunday lecture, reprinted from Der Zeitgeist, March 18, 1880.

MAIMONIDES AND RASHI

A lecture, reprinted from the Reform Advocate, September 2, 1905.

MOSES MENDELSSOHN AND MODERN JUDAISM

Address delivered before the Young Men's Hebrew Association of Louisville, March 20, 1879, in commemoration of the 150th Anniversary of the birth of Moses Mendelssohn.

LEOPOLD ZUNZ

¹ Memorial Address delivered before Beth-El Congregation, New York, March 20, 1886.

JEWISH WIT AND HUMOR

Lecture delivered at Beth-El Temple, New York, on Sunday, March 18th, 1888.

JEWISH SUPERSTITION

Lecture delivered at Beth-El Temple, New York, on Sunday, April 18th, 1888.

THE ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS TOWARD
JEWISH LITERATURE
1902

Menorah Monthly, Vol. 33, pp. 91-101

ASSYRIOLOGY AND THE BIBLE

Reprinted from Yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1903.

WHAT THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE STANDS FOR AND
WHAT THE PREREQUISITES AND OPPORTUNITIES
OF ITS STUDENTS ARE

Address delivered at the Opening of the H. U. C. Saturday, October 14, 1916.

THE SPIRIT OF GOD

Reprinted from the Hebrew Union College Monthly, April, 1919.

ZIONISM

Address delivered before the 'Judaicans,' New York City, March 3rd, 1898. Judaicans Address I (1899).

III

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF MY EARLY LIFE

First published in the Hebrew Union College Monthly, May, 1918.

DIE EIGENSCHAFTEN EINES GOTTBERUFENEN FÜHRER'S
DER GEMEINDE ISRAELS

Inaugural address delivered before Beth-El Congregation, Detroit, 1869.

ANTRITTSREDE

Inaugural Address Delivered at Sinai Temple, Chicago, November 11, 1871.

DIE PRINZIPIEN UND ZIELE DES REFORM-JUDENTHUMS

Inaugural lecture delivered before Beth-El Congregation, New York, September 6th, 1879.

**A PIONEER OF REFORM JUDAISM, DAVID EINHORN AND
HIS PLACE IN AMERICAN JEWISH LIFE**

Reprinted from the Jewish Tribune (January, 1920).

**MEMORIAL ADDRESS IN HONOR OF THE LATE
JACOB H. SCHIFF**

Delivered on Saturday, January 15, 1921 at the Hebrew Union College.

DR. ALEXANDER KOHUT

Address delivered at the Memorial Service, held June 17th, 1894, New York City, at the Temple Ahawath Chesed,

EMIL G. HIRSCH

Memorial address delivered before the Central Conference of American Rabbis, June 27th, 1923. Year Book 1923

**THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE OF YESTERDAY AND A
GREAT DESIDERATUM IN ITS CURRICULUM TO-DAY**

Reprinted from Hebrew Union College Jubilee volume, 1925.

1815

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



16 205 597

BMT 755 .K7A3	Kohler Studies, addresses, & personal papers 971823
MAY 28 '32 FEE 9 '32	A. Hornb 4706 W. 18th St
MAY 9 '32 MAY 28 '32	Leon Lerch 5474 University ave
MAY 28 '32 JUN 18 '32	Leon Lerch 6-11-32 5474 University ave

971823

~~Oriental Institute~~

BM

755

.K7A3

SWIFT LIBRARY